HURCH UNION IN CANADA

ts History, Motives, Doctrine, and Government

By

E. LLOYD MORROW

287.92 M883C c.1
Morrow, Ernest Lloyd, 1884-
Church Union in Canada, its
R.W.B. JACKSON LIBRARY
3 0005 02068 1089
OISE CIR

THE LIBRARY

The Ontario Institute

for Studies in Education

Toronto, Canada

LIBRARY
MAR 25 1969
THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE
FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION

Church Union in Canada

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

A Bibliography of the Ontological Argument.
(W. H. Gillespie Trust)
T. & T. Clark - Edinburgh, 1915

Church Union in Canada

Its History, Motives, Doctrine and Government

by E. LLOYD MORROW
M.A., (Tor.) B.D., (Edin.)

THOMAS ALLEN
PUBLISHER - - TORONTO

Copyright, 1923.
By Thomas Allen, Publisher,
Toronto.

To the Memory of
My Father
I Dedicate this Book

By this everyone will recognize that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another.

JOHN xiii, 35.

John said to him, "Teacher, we saw a man casting out demons in your name; but he does not follow us, and so we stopped him." Jesus said, "Do not stop him; no one who performs any miracle in my name will be ready to speak evil of me. He who is not against us is for us."

MARK ix, 38-40.

"The secret which underlies all fairness of judgment and true sympathy and appreciation, is that of putting oneself in the place of others, and appropriating the situation so as to conceive it from within and not from without."

REV. JOHN KELMAN, D.D.

Preface

When a controversy has gone on so long as that of Church Union in Canada, covering a period of twenty years, the scientific and objective view, which is indispensable to the solution of any profound question, is difficult for those who are entangled in it. Fortunately, the writer is not handicapped by such an entanglement, since for ten of those years he was wholly given up to the study of Arts and Theology at home and abroad. On return to Canada, and during his six years in the ministry of the Presbyterian Church, following the final vote on Union, he had no need to take up the gauntlet for or against Union.

Since the General Assembly of 1921, at which it was decided to go forward to Union "as expeditiously as possible"—whatever that may have meant, whether "speedily" or "cautiously," a disputed point—the old strife has been manifesting itself with renewed vigour. At the present time, the contending parties are apparently warming up in preparation for a big conflict over the recently proposed legislation championed by the Unionists, some of whose leaders at any rate and at any cost, are determined to put this "excellent" Bill through the various Provincial Legislatures and the Dominion Parliament; thus to enable them to consummate Organic Union of the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational churches in Canada.

It is well, then, at such a critical time as this, for one who is not known as a "Unionist" or an "Anti-unionist," to try to present in an impartial, neutral or at least judicial, objective and scientific manner the "pros and cons" of the history, motives, doctrine and correlated points of polity, set forth in the Basis of Union, which is an integral part of the proposed legislation.

In this book, the incorporation of my own personal judgments is almost inevitable. My sympathies will appear in the way in which I describe and evaluate the various movements. Certainly no unprejudiced person will object to this. But the main purpose of the book is to give information concerning the movement in so objective a fashion that it will be, I hope, a sourcebook for anyone, whether he happens to agree with my valuation or not. It is not a quarrel I am after. I am searching for facts with a view to a substantial addition to the expression and exposition of truth.

The whole question of Church Union is of great importance and of intense present day and world-wide interest. Preeminently is it so in Canada where the crisis of definite decision is now confronting us. This decision ought not to be made in any hasty or superficial manner. The results of the decision may be glorious or disastrous. It was a wise saying of Dr. Thomas Chalmers that "He who looks to the wrong quarter for a disease will in all likelihood betake himself to a wrong remedy." Despite the twenty years of discussion, negotiation, and proposed solution of this intricate problem, the writer feels that the diagnosis of the whole case is not yet complete or satisfactory. It has been neither wide enough nor sufficiently penetrative. Indeed he is convinced that there has been, and still is, much unreflecting excitement in the ecclesiastical mind as to what may or must be done, and too little appreciation of radical faults and errors vitiating many of the ideas and arguments both for and against Union.

Therefore, the writer has set himself to review and to interpret, in concise manner, the whole movement, and to do so without ill-will, fear or favour, not merely from an academic point of view but also with a keen sense of its practical magnitude. It is undoubtedly both academic and practical. To neglect either of these factors is to blur the issue.

In this high and difficult task, involving as it does deep spiritual issues, he calls upon the name of the Lord for light and guidance, that the attempt may not be partisan or futile, but at least to some extent, however humble, a contribution to the peace and prosperity of the Church of Christ and the Kingdom of God in Canada—Union or no Union.

"Pray that Jerusalem may have
Peace and felicity,
Let them that love Thee and Thy peace
Have still prosperity.

"Therefore, I wish that peace may still
Within Thy walls remain
And ever may Thy palaces
Prosperity retain."

TORONTO, May 1923. E. L. M.

Contents

PAGE

CHAPTER I.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNION MOVEMENT

A. Negotiations of Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists . 13
B. The Baptist Position Against Union 34
C. The Diversified Position of Anglicans on Union 40

CHAPTER II.

MOTIVES FOR AND AGAINST UNION

A. Motives For Union Stated 49
B. Motives Against Union Stated 70

CHAPTER III.

THE DOCTRINE IN THE BASIS OF UNION

(*The Text of the Doctrinal Basis is Printed in Appendix V.*)

A. Sources of The Twenty Articles of Doctrine 114
B. Changes in Doctrinal Basis (1906-1922) 122
C. No Credal Subscription in the Basis 130
D. What Men Think of The Doctrinal Basis 146
E. Denominational Gains and Losses in Union Proposal . . . 157
  I. Congregational Gains and Losses 159
  II. Methodist Gains and Losses 161
  III. Presbyterian Gains and Losses 180

CHAPTER IV.

WHAT THE NEW STANDARDS OF FAITH INVOLVE . . 214

CHAPTER V.

CHURCH GOVERNMENT IN THE BASIS OF UNION . . 233

CHAPTER VI.

THE QUESTION OF LEGAL OBSTACLES IN UNION PROPOSAL 274

CHAPTER VII.

THE KIND OF CHURCH UNION CANADA NEEDS . . . 284

PAGE

APPENDIX

I.

Brief Statement of The Reformed Faith (U. S. A. 1905) . . . 305

II.

The Articles of The Faith of The Presbyterian Church of England 309

III.

Doctrinal Basis of Union, Proposed by the Montreal Local Committee 315

IV.

Interim Report of The Sub-Committee on Doctrine, Based on I. and III. (above) 319

V.

The Basis of Union 322

VI.

A Statement of Faith. A Declaration of the National Congregational Council of 1913 (U. S. A.) 343

VII.

Brief Statement of The Church's Faith (United Free Church of Scotland, 1921) 344

VIII.

Lambeth Appeal (1920), and Resolutions X-XIV 348

IX.

THE PROPOSED ENABLING LEGISLATION

(*a*) Letter of Transmission 353
(*b*) Report of Counsel re Church Union 354
(*c*) Proposed Dominion Legislation 361
(*d*) Model Trust Deed 373
(*e*) Proposed Provincial Legislation 379
(*f*) Report of Union Committee of the Methodist Church . . 393

X.

Church of Scotland Act, 1921 395

XI.

A Bibliography on Church Union and Unity 398

ADDENDUM

I.

A Brief Commentary On The Twenty Articles of Doctrine . . 405

II.

A Way Out of The Church Union Impasse (A Federal Church Suggested), by The Rev. Dr. D. R. Drummond, D.D. . 435

Index 445

Church Union in Canada

Its History, Motives, Doctrine and Government

CHAPTER I.

The History of the Union Movement

A.

NEGOTIATIONS OF PRESBYTERIANS, METHODISTS, CONGREGATIONALISTS.

THE movement for organic church union in Canada has as its objective the formation of an ecclesiastical institution to be known as "The United Church of Canada." At present, however, this movement is confined to the three denominations named. The two former ones are strong numerically and financially; the third numbers but a few thousand members.

Organized opposition to Union has manifested itself only within the Presbyterian Church. Of other Protestant bodies in Canada, the Anglican and Baptist Churches were invited years ago to participate in the union movement. They declined for reasons which will appear later in this historical sketch.*

The idea of union was not new to any of the three negotiating churches. Reunion had become a fact long years before within the families of these respective churches. "The Congregational Union of Canada" is a title that speaks for itself. "The Methodist Church of Canada" dates from the Methodist consolidation of 1883. It was the result of previous unions in Canada, (1833-1883), between Methodist Episcopals, British Wesleyans, the Methodist New Connexion, the Primitive Methodists, and the Bible Christians.† "The Presbyterian Church in Canada", dating from 1875, is the sequel to six unions, (1817-1875), whose history can be traced intelligently only by an expert in the manifold divisions of Scottish Christianity.‡

---

*See Chapter I. B and C.

†For detailed study, see Art. by E. Thomas, (*Amer. Journal of Theol.* July, 1919); also Bishop Neely's book on *American Methodism* (Revell).

‡See Dr. W. Gregg's *History of The Pres. Ch. in Canada*, (Toronto); also Prin. D. J. Fraser's Article (*Harv. Theol. Review*, July, 1915).

The two great unions, that of 1875 (Presbyterian) and that of 1883 (Methodist), took place in time close to the Confederation of the Provinces into the Dominion of Canada in 1867, and share in the spirit of that achievement. Both these unions were very successful. They created a broad spiritual vision, and struck the high note of national responsibility. Mission expansion at home and abroad is a vital part of their abundant fruitage. There are those who argue enthusiastically that the happy experience of these churches in the matter of union within their own denominations has made the still wider interdenominational union, now proposed a credibility.*

In the Dominion of Canada, at that time so sparsely settled, political, social, and religious conditions all tended to produce approximations both in temper and organization. The great task of ministering to the spiritual needs of people so widely scattered over such an immense territory, necessitated the evolving of a plan by which economy might be practised in the saving of men and money. The outcome of this mutual demand on young and plastic churches, was the statesmanlike declaration of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (1899), in favor of co-operation with other churches in new fields.

Ere that movement for co-operation was fairly begun, a great migration into the Canadian prairie provinces took place. This made more evident the need and challenge of combined action on the part of these young churches facing common and gigantic tasks in a new land. A few church leaders stirred by the magnitude of the problem, and inspired by the success of co-operation began to dream of a closer bond than co-operation.

It was in 1902 that the more radical scheme of organic union was advocated as opportune for the co-operating Communions. In a very sudden and fortuitous manner, Principal Patrick† launched the then frail bark of organic union on the calm sea of ecclesiastical politics—a sea destined to become rough with the waves of opposition to the proposed merger.

---

*See S. W. Dyde's Article *Journal of Religion* (Univ. of Chic. Press, March 1922).

†Principal Patrick of Pres. Coll., Winnipeg.

While conveying the greetings of the Presbyterian General Assembly at Winnipeg to the Methodist General Conference, also in session there, this distinguished Scotchman of two and a half years' residence in Canada, decided on the spur of the moment to press the subject of organic union, "which was then much in his thoughts"; but its advocacy entirely unauthorized by the Presbyterian Assembly or people.*

The outcome of Dr. Patrick's bold adventure was that, "a day or two later, the Methodist Conference passed a memorable declaration in favour of church union among the Protestant Churches in Canada, and then proceeded to invite by name the Congregational and Presbyterian Churches to confer with them as to the steps which might be taken to bring these three bodies into organic union with one another. This declaration and invitation are the principal source of the present movement for union."†

Thus it came to pass that the Methodist Church officially inaugurated the organic union proposal, and did so by making and adopting unanimously the following aforesaid resolution:

"While the conference declares itself in favor of a measure of organic unity wide enough to embrace all the evangelical denominations in Canada, and regrets that hitherto all efforts and negotiations have failed to result in the formulation of such a comprehensive scheme, so that the outlook for it at present does not seem practicable;

Yet inasmuch as the problem of the unification of several of these denominations appears to present much less serious obstacles, since their relations are already marked by a great degree of spiritual unity, and they have already become closely assimilated in standards and ideals of church life, forms of worship, and ecclesiastical polity;

And since, further, the present conditions of our country and those in the immediate prospect demand the most careful economy of the resources of the leading and aggressive evangelical denominations both in ministers and money, in order to overtake the religious needs of the people pouring into our new settlements, which economy seems impossible without further organic unity, or its equivalent;

This general Conference is of the opinion that the time is

---

*See Dr. Patrick's own account of his speech (*Presbyterian*, Toronto, May 12, 1910).

†*Ibid.*

opportune for a definite practical movement concentrating attention on and aiming at the practical organic unity of these denominations already led by Providence into such close fraternal relations;

And whereas a definite proposal has been discussed to some extent in the press and elsewhere, looking to ultimate organic union of the Presbyterian, Congregational, and Methodist Churches in Canada, this Conference, in no spirit of exclusiveness towards others not named, declares it would regard a movement with this object in view with great gratification believing that the deliberate friendly discussion of the doctrinal, practical, and administrative problems involved, with the purpose of reaching an agreement, would not only facilitate the finding and formulation of a Basis of Union, but would also educate the people interested into a deeper spirit of unity, and into that spirit of reasonable concession on which the successful consummation of such movements ultimately so largely depends.

And this General Conference would further recommend this movement to the prayerful interest and sympathy of the Methodist Church in the devout hope that if organic union of the denominations named be achieved, it may be accompanied with great blessings to the church and to the nation at large and redound to the greater glory of God.

That a representative committee, to be composed of seven ministers and seven laymen, with the General Superintendent, be appointed to receive communications on the subject of foregoing resolutions from the churches named, confer with committees that may be appointed by such churches, and report to the next General Conference."

(That would be in 1906, as the General Conference or the supreme court of the Methodist Church meets only once in four years, while the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church meets annually).

The Congregational Union, which as early as 1887 had affirmed the readiness of its churches to enter into any movement in the direction of Union "consistent with what they believed to be the New Testament principle of righteousness and freedom", accepted the Methodist invitation in due course. But the 1903 General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church merely referred the invitation to its committee on correspondence.* This committee having met with the committees of the Methodist and Congregational Churches on the 21st April, 1904, reported to the 1904 Presbyterian Assembly the unan-

---

*Presbyterian *Assembly Minutes*, 1903.

imous approval of these committees of the organic union proposal "as both desirable and practicable." Unionists urged the Assembly that "to decline a proposal for a Committee to confer would not be courteous to a sister church."†

Whereupon the General Assembly appointed a union committee to consider the practicability of such a union and to confer with similar committees of the churches concerned.‡

Before referring to the various conferences that followed, a few facts should be noted as throwing light on the general situation at the time. They are:

(1) It is quite evident that at the very outset the committees appointed by the several churches had entertained, during the years 1899 to 1903, no greater hope than that of an increased friendly co-operation, especially in the field of Home Missions.** Their efforts were put forth at that time solely to prevent, as far as possible, any unseemly rivalry and waste of men and means through overlapping in the Mission work carried on by these different churches, particularly in the newer districts of the country. But as we have observed Dr. Patrick's speech to the members of the Methodist Conference swung the scheme of co-operation into the channel of Organic Union.

(2) All who voted for resolutions favourable to church union in those initial stages of the movement were not as optimistic as they were sympathetic.†† There were obstructions, personal, constitutional, and traditional. Hence there was much mental reservation on the part of even those who voted union. The vote expressed sympathy with the ideal rather than assured confidence in the possibility of its being put into successful operation. Men voted for union for various reasons, for example: (*a*) They were unwilling to seem opposed to a measure declared by unionists to seek to answer the prayer of our Lord ("that they all may be one"), even though dubious as to the practical significance of their action. This argument based on poor exegesis and uncontrolled emotionalism is a striking example of many arguments used then

---

†Dr. E. Scott's letter (*Meth. Christian Guardian,* August 23, 1922).
‡Presbyterian *Assembly Minutes,* 1904.
***Ibid* (1922), historical sketch.
††Chancellor Wallace (*The Canadian Baptist,* Jan. 12, 1905).

and now, in the interests of organic union which were and are logically arguments for spiritual unity. This confusion, due to lack of clear thinking and undue zeal for organic union on the part of certain leaders, resulted in many being induced to vote for the proposed merger. (*b*) The assurances that union would not be consummated without the practically unanimous consent of the people, caused many "anti-unionists" to desist from open opposition. They predicted that the Presbyterian membership would never give that majority. It is of importance to observe that no majority of the membership of the Presbyterian Church has as yet (1923) been given in favour of the proposed union.

Moreover "Church Union in Scotland had been brought about by a process that did not fully unify. The legal decision of the Privy Council in the Free Church case, aroused in some minds a fear that the whole effort was futile and might as well be ended at the start.*

Although among Presbyterians, some able leaders like Principals Caven and Grant were Unionists, and despite large union majorities, "those behind" the scenes (at the beginning of the Union movement) knew that great numbers of this denomination were strongly opposed to organic union. Even Principal Caven's strong views for Union were opposed with equal earnestness by two of his colleagues at an annual conference of Knox College Alumni.†

Certain social differences too, between Presbyterians and Methodists, rarely referred to in public discussion, were no insignificant part of the more private discussion of the matter.‡ I personally deprecate arguments arising out of social distinctions as unchristian. But I rejoice to state that in my wide research I have found only three references to this unfortunate argument; one was by an anti-union professor, the other two by professors in favour of union; one of these professors quite unnecessarily has given passionate expression against this argument in the public press. I may say that to my knowledge it is not an argument at all used by the Presbyterians, who believe that the time has not yet arrived for

---

*E. Thomas (*American Journal of Theol.* July, 1919).
†Chancellor Wallace (*The Canadian Baptist*, August 23, 1922).
‡E. Thomas (*American Journal of Theol.* July, 1919).

the discontinuance of their historic church, as a separate identity.

(3) The part taken by the Congregationalists counted for comparatively little. They were few and uninfluential in Canada. Besides, standing as they did for emphasis on the practical side of religious teaching, and holding distinguishing doctrines lightly, organic union would naturally cost them very little from the theological point of view.*

The Methodists, laymen and ministers alike, were the strongest advocates of union. Certain of their sagacious business men pressed for the application, of the sound business principles successfully used by the industrial and commercial world, to the management of church affairs.† This economic argument struck a responsive note in many Presbyterian hearts, whilst great numbers then and now fear this as "a commercialization of religion."

(4) In the initial stages of the union movement there was a slight tendency to emphasize each other's peculiar denominational quality. As for instance, "On the eve of the first session of the joint committee three persons met in Montreal and talked over the situation. The first, a foremost Congregationalist, remarked, 'The outstanding difficulty in the way of progress is the self-complacency of the Presbyterians. They think they have all the scholarship.' The second, reared in the Presbyterian fold, answered, 'Yes, and the Methodists think they have all the piety.' To this the third, a Methodist, added, 'But neither have any to spare.' "‡

At the first meeting of the joint committee so marked were these "misconceptions and misgivings" that it seemed as though the Session would prove futile. A "unanimous report", by the Presbyterians, however, saved the situation. "The outcome of the meeting was a declaration that without committing their churches to any specific policy the delegates were 'of one mind that organic union is desirable and practicable,' and the whole subject was, as stated heretofore, commended to the favourable consideration of the chief assemblies of the churches concerned.§

---

*Chancellor Wallace (*The Canadian Baptist,* August 23, 1922).
†*Ibid.*
‡E. Thomas (*American Journal of Theol.* July, 1919).
§*Ibid.*

Thereupon, the committees were strengthened, so that sixty members came from each of the larger bodies and thirty from the Congregational churches. The ground was surveyed in a preliminary way, and subcommittees were appointed to deal with the following aspects of the problem: (1) doctrine, (2) polity, (3) ministry, including term of pastorate, (4) administration, and (5) law. These sub-committees worked at their assigned tasks, and the first to complete its work was that on doctrine. "Indeed so very little difficulty was experienced here that some thoughtful observers wondered whether too little consideration was being given to the great facts of religion for which the United Church should stand."

It is refreshing to learn that during the five years spent by the joint committee on their assigned task, all went well. A fair, frank, and conciliatory temper was characteristic of the proceedings. "There was no sign of ecclesiastical partisanship."* Despite numerous divisions on major and minor points of differences, there was no single instance of a vote of church against church. All divisions were mixed denominationally. Two principles actuated the endeavours of the committee. "The first was to find an adequate place in the United Church for the special aspects of Christian truth and life embodied in the principles of the negotiating churches."† The second was to prepare a statement of doctrine, polity, administration and ministerial training that would form as far as possible an up-to-date Basis of Union. Unfortunately the lapse of many years has rendered much of the result of this effort obsolete. It is particularly so in relation to doctrine as we shall see in subsequent chapters of this book.

The Conferences:

With the exception of the first, the five conferences of the Joint Committee, extending over the period from December 1904 to December 1908, were all held in the Metropolitan Methodist Church, Toronto. The first took place in Knox Presbyterian Church, Toronto.

It is not necessary for our purpose to rehearse the scanty official minutes of these five conferences in detail. The

---

*Principal Patrick (*The Presbyterian,* May 12, 1910).
†Principal Patrick (*The Presbyterian,* May 12, 1910).

results of the denominational sub-committee's deliberations as amended and adopted by the Joint Committee, were published each year for the information of the negotiating churches along with the official report of the Proceedings of the Joint Committee.

The action of the Presbyterian General Assembly has always been overwhelmingly in favour of Union despite growing opposition in the Presbyterian Church.

The first report of the Union Committee was submitted to the Assembly of 1905 at Kingston. There was some discussion but no amendment was moved.

At the London Assembly (1906), an amendment was submitted by non-organic-unionists to the effect that the proposed union was not in the best interests of the Presbyterian Church in particular or of Christian life and work in general. The suggestion was added that any further negotiations should be along the line of federal or co-operative union. The amendment was defeated by 179 votes to 22. The same Assembly resolved to invite the Anglican and Baptist churches to take part in the negotiations. Replies were in due time received. The reply of the Anglicans laid down the Lambeth Quadrilateral as a necessary basis of negotiations with them. The Baptist reply was decisively negative but put on a lofty spiritual plane, and springing spontaneously from a deep conviction that the Baptist Church had a special mission of its own to carry out.*

It should perhaps be added as an interesting matter of history, that it is claimed by unionists that the resolution of the 1906 Presbyterian Assembly to extend the area of negotiations for union was taken independently of the high-toned address in which Bishop Williams presented the greetings of his diocese to the Assembly, and reminded the Court that it had not replied to the suggestion of a closer connection between the churches, made by the Anglican Church eighteen years before.†

At the 1907 Assembly, held at Montreal, "the adversaries of organic union proposed that the whole question of union and the desirability of organic union should be submitted to the Church. Their amendment was not persevered with. It was withdrawn by leave of the House in favour of a proposal asking that Presbyteries, Sessions and Congregations should express their judgment on the whole question. This last amendment was presented by Unionists. It was defeated by 124 votes to 60 in favour of the motion, "which simply called for "information and suggestions," from Presbyteries, Sessions and Congregations, for the guidance of the Union Committee in their task of framing a Basis of Union."*

---

*See Chapt. I., B and C, for full information concerning Anglican and Baptist replies.

†The Gist of Dr. Patrick's Statement, (*The Presbyterian,* May 19, 1910).

The Winnipeg Assembly (1908), recorded its satisfaction at the Union Committee's finding that so far as they had gone, union was judged by them to be practicable. The Assembly defeated an amendment (by 156 votes to 32 votes), which demanded that the Union Committee restrict its labours to the task of preventing overlapping among the evangelical churches of the country.†

It is fitting to mention here that on Friday, December 11th, 1908, the Joint Committee on Union adopted its so called 'completed task' of drawing up a Basis of Union. Since that date only the article on Prayer has been added and a few minor changes made.‡

The Hamilton Assembly 1909, received the fifth and concluding report of the Union Committee. This Committee reported that the Joint Committee of the negotiating churches had arrived at the conclusion that the proposed union was practicable. It was moved that the Assembly ascertain the mind of the church at large, but that this vote should not be taken before September 1910, the date fixed for the regular Quadrennial Conference of the Methodist Church. An amendment to this motion was moved which proposed that another Committee be appointed to meet with similar Committees from the two negotiating churches, to ascertain whether or not a plan of federation could not be formulated; and if so that the two schemes of Federation and Organic Union should be submitted to the judgment of sessions and

---

*See *Assembly Minutes*, 1907.
†*Assembly Minutes*, 1908.
‡See Chapter III, B.

congregations for their choice or disapproval. The Motion carried over this amendment by 160 to 42. The same Assembly also directed that copies of the Union Committee's report be sent down to Presbyteries, sessions and congregations.

The following dissents were lodged by those opposed to organic union:

(1) That the Presbyterian Church is not constitutionally competent to take the step taken by this vote.*

(2) The vote would be confusing, the issues at stake not being clear to the Assembly.

(3) That the interests of the people are not in any way safeguarded by the decision arrived at.

(4) That the matter should go to the congregations without being prejudiced by a vote of the Assembly.

(5) That faith had not been kept with the people in giving them an opportunity to express their mind on the whole question heretofore.

(6) That adequate discussion of the vital issue involved, namely, the continued existence of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, was not permitted many members of Assembly who desired and had a right to express their views.†

In 1910 The General Assembly adopted the following resolution:

"The Assembly declare their approval of the Documents agreed upon by the Joint Committee as a basis upon which this Church may unite with the Methodist and Congregational churches, and they direct that this resolution, along with the above-mentioned Documents, be transmitted to Presbyteries for their judgment under the Barrier Act, instructing Presbytery Clerks to report the decisions arrived at to the clerks of the General Assembly not later than the first day of May, 1911.

"The Assembly are of opinion that, in the event of the returns from Presbyteries warranting further steps being taken in the direction of union, the Assembly of 1911 will proceed to consult Sessions and Congregations regarding the whole matter."

The "anti-unionists" declare that "like a bolt from the blue, came the recommendation of the union committee, or rather the members of it who happened to be present at the

---

*See "Barrier Act," at close of Chapter IV.
†*Assembly Minutes,* 1909.

Assembly in Halifax in 1910, that the Basis be approved, and sent down—not to the people to learn their will, as so often promised—but to Presbyteries under the Barrier Act, an official step towards Union, which disregarded the rights of the people, and went directly in the face of all the assurances that no such step would be taken until the people had given their judgment."*

"That recommendation was rushed through the Assembly with unfair and unseemly haste."

The form of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly left room for the suspicion that, should the Presbyteries approve the scheme, it might be ratified without reference to the people. This provoked resentment and organized opposition. From that time there was an organized party in opposition and something approaching party strife within the Presbyterian Church, which made it obviously undesirable to hasten decision.†

The Union Movement 1911-1922.‡

The report of the vote by Presbyteries to the General Assembly of 1911 was that, of the 70 Presbyteries of the Church 67 voted on the question. 50 Presbyteries voted to approve, while 20 did not signify approval in terms of the Barrier Act. The votes cast in the Presbyteries were: 793, approval, and 476, non-approval. The Assembly sent the whole question down to Sessions and Congregations for their judgment.

The General Conference of the Methodist Church in 1910 declared "its approval of these documents agreed upon by the Joint Committee as a basis upon which the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational churches may unite." It further directed the General Conference Special Committee to send the documents "to the District Meetings for consideration, and to the Annual Conference for consideration and adoption or rejection;" and "if the reports from the Annual

---

*Presbyterian Literature (Committee for Continuance Pres. Ch.). See also Chapter VII.

†E. Thomas (*American Journal Theol.* July, 1919).

‡This is taken verbatim from the Assembly Minutes 1922, for the sake of brevity and impartiality. Proceedings since then re the Enabling Legislation are dealt with in Chapter VII.

Conference warrant such action, to send the documents of the Basis of Union to the Official Boards and the membership of the Church for consideration and adoption or rejection," and gave authority to the General Conference Special Committee, if the result of the vote would warrant the action, "to call a special meeting of the General Conference further to consider the matter of consummating the proposed union."

The result of the vote by Conferences was that 11 Conferences voted approval, and 1 non-approval. The vote by members was: 1,579 voted approval and 270 non-approval. The General Conference Special Committee by resolution directed that the whole question be referred to the official boards and membership of the church.

The Congregational Union in 1909, after reciting the steps taken and referring to various subjects contained in the Basis, adopted the following:

"The Congregational Union at its annual meeting in 1904 decided "that organic union is both desirable and practicable. It now remains to decide whether organic union on the basis prepared by the Joint Committee is desirable and practicable. As this must be determined in the Congregational way by the votes of the churches your Committee would recommend that the documents agreed upon by the Joint Committee, along with this report, be sent to the churches for consideration."

The vote of the elders, officials and members taken in the three negotiating churches was as follows:

Presbyterian: in answer to the question, "Are you in favor of organic union with the Methodist and Congregational churches?" of 9,675 elders, 6,245 voted for, 2,475 against. Of 287,944 communicants, 106,755 voted for, and 48,278 against. Of the adherents, 37,175 voted for, and 14,174 against. In answer to the question: "Do you approve of the proposed Basis of Union?" 5,104 elders voted for, and 2,192 against. 77,993 communicants voted for, and 27,197 against; 27,756 adherents voted for, and 10,316 against.

Methodist: Of 29,280 officials, 23,475 voted for, and 3,869 against. Of 293,967 members, 18 years of age and over, 150,841 voted for and 24,357 against. Of 29,373 members under 18 years of age, 17,198 voted for, and 2,615 against. Of adherents, 42,115 voted for, and 7,234 against.

Congregationalist: Of 10,689 members, 2,933 voted for, and 813 against the Basis.

Subsequent to the taking of the vote the courts of the negotiating churches took the following action:

The Congregational Union of Canada resolved "That this Union considers the action it has already taken as sufficient and will now wait until the other negotiating bodies have had an opportunity of testing to a corresponding degree the feeling of their constituencies." (*Year-Book,* 1910,-11, p. 31).

The General Conference Special Committee of the Methodist Church declared itself "satisfied that the Methodist Church is now prepared to proceed toward the Union of the three negotiating churches on the Basis of Union heretofore agreed upon." (*Minutes* July 16-17, 1912).

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church resolved as follows: "In view of the extent of the minority, which is not yet convinced that organic union is the best method of expressing the unity sincerely desired by all, the Assembly deems it unwise immediately to proceed to consummate the union, but believes that by further conference and discussion practically *unanimous action** can be secured within a reasonable time. It also resolved that all suggestions "be referred to the Union Committee for their consideration in the hope of removing objections and with a view to further conferences with the Committees of the other negotiating churches." (*Minutes,* 1912, pp. 45-46).

In 1913 the Assembly resolved that for the fullest and fairest consideration of every aspect of the question further amendments to the present basis of union and alternative proposals be invited and referred to its union committee, "in order that after considering them it may again enter into conference with the Committees of the other negotiating churches, with the view of setting before our people a final presentation of the question for their judgment." (Appendices to *Minutes,* p. 302).

In 1914 the Assembly invited the Methodist and Congregational churches to meet in joint committee with its own Union Committee, in order to consider an amended Basis and to prepare a Basis that might be submitted to the Assembly of 1915. (*Minutes,* 1914, p. 41).

---

*Italics mine.

Meanwhile the Congregational Union had reappointed its Union Committee year by year, and in 1914 the General Conference of the Methodist Church, in response to the above invitation, reappointed its Union Committee. These Committees met in joint conference in Bond Street Congregational Church, Toronto, on the 16th and 17th of December, 1914, and discussed (1) the proposed changes in the basis of union suggested by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, (2) changes suggested by the denominational committees on church union, (3) the name to be given to the united church and the names to be given to the courts and officials of the united church, (4) the legal aspects of the whole question of church union, (5) other matters preparatory to the final recommendation regarding church union to be presented to the proper courts of the negotiating churches. Upon these various subjects conclusions were reached which are embodied in an amended basis of union attached hereto. (See Appendix V.).

Developments, 1914-21.

Congregational Church:

In June, 1915, the Union Committee expressed its approval of the amended basis as submitted, its gratification that the negotiations so long pending had been advanced another stage, and the hope, that there would be no unnecessary delay in bringing the proposed union to a successful consummation.

In June, 1916, after hearing the report of the action of the Presbyterian Assembly, the Union expressed itself through the Committee as being prepared to continue its policy of patiently waiting until further action was taken by the Presbyterian Church, holding itself in readiness to take all necessary constitutional and legal steps when these should be called for.

In 1917 and 1918 no special action was taken other than to agree to continue all forms of co-operation that had been organized, gratification being expressed over what had been accomplished.

In 1920 the Committee again emphasized the necessity of patiently waiting, urging at the same time continued co-operation, while guarding against any weakening, disintegration or slackening of endeavour in this period of uncertainty.

In 1921 joy was expressed over the action of the Presbyterian Assembly in its vote to consummate the union, and the Committee was instructed to take such action as might be found necessary to bring the corporate union into effect as speedily as possible.

Methodist Church:

The General Conference of the Methodist Church in 1918 received and confirmed the action of the Committee on Church Union, in December, 1914, specifically concerning the name to be given the United Church, and its governing bodies and courts; considered the action of the negotiating churches and adopted the following:—"The General Conference, while recognizing the acute situation resulting from long delay, would counsel patience, a wise and Christian endeavour to meet pressing local situations by co-operation, a cordial spirit towards those local Methodist and Presbyterian congregations that have with good intent anticipated the consummation of organic union, and always a loyal devotion to the work of Christ committed to our Church." In token of the whole hearted purpose of the Methodist Church to consummate church union at the earliest possible time the Church Union Committee was reappointed, and authority given to call the General Conference in special session if necessary.

In October, 1921, the General Conference Special Committee sent forward the following to the Joint Committee on Church Union:—"In our opinion, a prerequisite to any extension of co-operation is the appointment of a joint committee, instructed to consider and prepare such legislation as will be needed to give effect to the decisions of the churches by the statutory incorporation of the United Church of Canada. When this has been done the minds of our people will be more clear as to the situation, and it will be possible to consider measures for the increased efficiency and economy of common enterprises."

Presbyterian Church:

In 1915, the Assembly at Kingston, when deciding to submit the whole question of Union to Presbyteries, Sessions and Members and Adherents, arrived at the following finding, which was adopted by a vote of 368 for and 74 against.

"This Assembly hereby declares its approval of the 'Basis of Union', now submitted, as a basis on which this Church may unite with the Methodist and Congregational churches, and directs that the said basis be transmitted to Presbyteries for their judgment under the Barrier Act, and that the Appendix on Law be also transmitted to Presbyteries for their judgment, and that this Resolution be sent therewith:—

The Assembly also directs—

That the question of Union be submitted to Sessions, and also to Communicants and Adherents of the church, in the following form: "Are you in favor of Union with the Methodist and Congregational churches of Canada on the Basis of Union approved by the General Assembly of 1915? Yes. No."

N.B. The people are reminded that the decision on this question must be reached on the basis of the votes cast."

In 1916, at Winnipeg, the results of the vote on the question of Union, submitted to Presbyteries, Sessions and Members and Adherents, were reported to the Assembly. The votes stood as follows:—

Presbyteries	Approving remit	53	
	Disapproving remit	13	
	Ties	3	
	Irrelevant returns	2	
	Rejected (Cariboo)	1	
	No returns from	4	
			76

Session: 7,066 For, 3,822 Against.
Communicants: 106,534 For, 69,913 Against.
Adherents: 36,942 For, 20,004 Against.
Pastoral Charges & Mission Fields: 1,331 For, 494 Against.

The Assembly expressed its findings as follows, by a vote of 406 for and 90 against:—

1. "That in accordance with its recommendations this General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, do now resolve to unite with the Methodist Church of Canada, and the Congregational Churches of Canada, to constitute 'The United Church of Canada', on the Basis of Union, approved by the General Assembly of 1915, and by the majority of Presbyteries since consulted under the Barrier Act.

2. That a Committee be appointed to carry out the policy of the Assembly, and to act in co-operation with Committees of the Methodist and Congregational Churches of Canada, in obtaining the necessary legal advice and in taking such steps as may be deemed proper to prepare for making application to the Dominion and Provincial Legislatures for such legislation as may be necessary to secure the conveyance of property to the United Church.

That this Committee report to the first Assembly following the end of the first year after the close of the War, and that, with the consent and authority of that Assembly, application be made for the legislation proposed at the following Session of the Dominion Parliament and the Provincial Legislatures.

3. That provision be made in this legislation to conserve the property rights of *all congregations that may determine* by a majority vote of the communicants, *not to enter** the United Church.

4. That the union be consummated as soon after the securing of legislation as the regular steps can be taken."

In Montreal, the Assembly again considered the question of Union, and passed the following Resolution:—

1. That the Assembly express its sincere sympathy with the desire conveyed in many of the Overtures to avoid disunion among the membership of our own Church, and to this end earnestly urge upon our people that debate and organized propagandism on either side be discontinued in the meantime, and that a spirit of prayer be cultivated.

2. That inasmuch as the resolution of the last Assembly sets forth that further action will not be taken until the second Assembly after the close of the War, to secure peace in the meantime, the Assembly urges that controversy on the matter of Organic Union be dropped by all parties; that no attempt be made at the present time to set forth in detail the action appropriate to a future period, but that the Church patiently await the new light which it may receive by Divine guidance *through the growing experience** of the people, and the lessons of the War.

The question of Union was next considered in June, 1921, in St. James Square Church, Toronto, when the following decision was reached:—

---

*(Italics and footnote mine). The approval by the 1923 General Assembly of the proposed legislation would break this pledge of the 1916 Assembly; because Congregations are not to be allowed to vote themselves into, but only out of Union; and to where? For answer, see Chapter VI.

1. That whereas the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada has already by a large majority expressed itself in favor of Organic Union with the Methodist and Congregational churches of Canada—

That whereas two appeals to the members and adherents of the Presbyterian Church in Canada have resulted in a similar way—

That whereas, during the time when by general agreement the matter of Union was not discussed, nothing has occurred to change the mind of the Church, but rather to confirm and strengthen its previous decision—

Therefore, be it resolved that this General Assembly take such steps as may be deemed best to consummate organic union with the above named churches *as expeditiously as possible.**

2. That a representative committee be appointed, with instructions to confer with the negotiating churches, and to carry out the policy of this Assembly, and to report to the next General Assembly.

3. That in order to facilitate a larger measure of Christian unity the Assembly declares that Presbyterians, who for the sake of Christian unity, unite with Union Affiliated congregations, organized on the plan authorized by the General Assembly, may justly consider themselves in vital fellowship and communion with the Presbyterian Church in Canada, even if for purposes of discipline and order they may be under a Methodist Conference or Congregational Union, and that the other negotiating churches be invited to take similar action.

4. That the Assembly instruct its Boards, Committees, Courts, and Congregations to carry out the largest possible measure of co-operation with similar bodies of the other negotiating churches, particularly in the education of candidates for the ministry, Church Publications, Mission and Social Service Work.

5. That a Committee, acting in harmony with Synodical Committees on co-operation, be requested to co-operate with similar committees of the Methodist and Congregational Churches, or Sunday Schools, in conferring with Independent Union churches, to the end that a better understanding and closer fellowship among all concerned may be promoted.

6. That the Assembly permit, with the consent of the local Presbytery, Presbyterian congregations uniting with Methodist or Congregational churches, according to the plan authorized by the Assembly, and in affiliation with one or other of the negotiating churches, to dispose of church property for the purpose of the united congregation.

7. That the Assembly guarantees to continue the rights of

---

*Italics mine.

ministers in good standing in our church to such of our ministers as serve in united congregations in affiliation with one or other of the negotiating churches and such of our ministers as may hereafter be called to serve in Independent Union congregations only when their settlement is approved by the Presbytery within whose bounds the Independent Union Church is situated.

Joint Committee on Church Union:

The Joint Committee on Church Union met October 21st, 1921, in Metropolitan Methodist Church, Toronto. There were welcomed to this meeting three regularly appointed representatives of the General Council of Union churches. Brief statements were made by representatives of each of the negotiating churches concerning their present attitude towards the consummation of union. A representative of the General Council of Local Union churches traced the development of the Union Church Movement in Western Canada, and assured the Joint Committee that "the Local Union churches are ready to merge into the United Church of Canada as soon as the contemplated union is effected." These four statements profoundly impressed the Committee:

The material decisions of the meetings were as follows:

1. "That a standing Committee on Law and Legislation be appointed to consider and report on the Legislation necessary to give effect to the Union of the negotiating churches, and to have prepared copies of all proposed bills to be submitted to the Parliament of Canada, and such other legislative bodies as may be necessary in the premises, to be submitted to a further meeting of this Committee, and thereafter to the Supreme Courts of the negotiating churches; and, further that the Legislation Committee have the power to secure the necessary assistance.

2. That we record our appreciation of the loyalty of Local Union churches to the parent churches; invite their General Council to send three representatives, as corresponding members, to future meetings of the Committee; suggest that Synods, Conferences and Associations consider the advisability of requesting the Local Union churches to send representatives (Laymen and Ministers) to attend their meetings, as corresponding members; welcome the assurance that Local Union Churches will support the enterprises of the parent churches not less than the average gifts before Union and express gratitude for the help now being contributed towards these activities; and that the agreements reached in 1917 regarding Local Union Churches, and Local Federations, be revised to meet present needs.

3. That gratification be expressed over the considerable measure of co-operation already effected in Departmental activities and suggest that each Board or Committee make a survey of its own interests in the light of the contemplated union; also, confer with similar Committees in the other churches to discover any larger measures of practicable and advisable co-operation; and that such co-operation be reported to the Joint Standing Committee.

4. That we give hearty encouragement to our congregations and church courts that are considering the re-arrangement of their fields.

5. That this Joint Committee on Church Union, in this closing session, expresses its deep gratitude to Almighty God for the truly Christian spirit that has characterized all its discussions and finds in the brotherliness and mutual consideration exhibited in the earnest anxiety to adopt those measures most conducive to the progress of Christ's Kingdom and to the peace and harmony of His Church, the promise of rich spiritual blessing to the Dominion of Canada."*

---

*For an interpretation of the logic of events in this historical sketch, see Chapter VII.

The History of the Union Movement

B.

THE POSITION OF THE BAPTISTS AGAINST UNION.

A little over a year before the formulation of the basis of union was completed, the Anglicans and Baptists were invited by a joint committee of Congregationalists, Methodists and Presbyterians to enter into the union negotiations. To these invitations replies were in due time received. That of the Anglicans is dealt with in the next section, entitled, "The Position of the Anglicans on Union." The Baptists replied in the form of an uncompromising pronouncement, which was intended to close out all prospect of Organic Union. In it they set forth their own characteristic Baptist principles, declaring that these made it "necessary to maintain a separate organized existence" and required them "to propagate their views throughout the world." The Baptist Churches in Canada during all the intervening years (1907-1922) have not receded from this pronouncement, and Union is accordingly not above the horizon.

I now give fully the lengthy Baptist deliverance, because of its vital importance not only from the standpoint of doctrinal implications but of its official rejection of Organic Union as an ideal.

Report of Committee of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec on Church Union:

"On behalf of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec we desire to express to the united Committees of the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational bodies our deep appreciation of the Christian courtesy in inviting us to conference with a special Committee on the question of the union of Protestant Christian bodies in Canada. We also desire to congratulate them on the substantial progress which appears to have been made toward such a union by the three bodies which have hitherto been engaged in these negotiations. In regard to our relation to this movement permit us to present the following statement as expressive of the position which we feel compelled to take:—

The Baptist people rejoice in all the manifestations of mutual love among the followers of Jesus Christ and seek on their own part to cultivate a holy fellowship with all Christians. They recognize with thankfulness the gracious operation of the Spirit of God among their brethren of other denominations and feel themselves to be one with them in many of those things which concern the progress of the Kingdom of God on earth. At the same time they do not admit that the organic union of all Christians is an essential condition of Christian unity or even necessarily promotive of it. For Christians who differ on questions which some of them hold to be of vital importance it is surely better to admit the impracticability of corporate union than to seek to compass such a Union at the cost of sacrificing cherished convictions.

In their organization of independent local churches and in their associational gatherings and conventions Baptists have not infrequently made use of brief statements of doctrines which they hold to be Christian, as a basis of mutual co-operation, but do not seek to establish a uniform confession for all their churches, nor do they regard assent to any fixed confessional statement as a pre-requisite to membership in a Baptist church or to a place in the Baptist ministry. They feel that the free and independent interpretation of the Scriptures by each man for himself, combined with the spirit of love and obedience, is not only promotive of earnest reflection on divine things and strength of personal conviction, but is a surer and more enduring way of securing unity among Christians. They oppose any tendency to erect a human standard of authority over the conscience, to lessen the sense of direct personal responsibility to God, or to obscure the consciousness of immediate relationships with Him. Accordingly, while they entertain a deep respect for various historic Christian creeds they are not solicitous to identify themselves with these creeds or to claim any organic relation with the churches that established them as standards of belief.

The Baptist people regard all truly religious affiliations as reposing, on the one hand, on God's gracious self-communication to human souls, and, on the other hand, on each man's free acceptance to the Divine grace and obedience to the Divine Will. As we understand the Scriptures, only those who are the subjects of such a spiritual experience are capable of participation in Christian fellowship or entitled to membership in a Christian church. Believing, therefore, in the spirituality of the Christian church, that is, that a Christian church is constituted by voluntary union of those alone who by personal repentance and faith,—not by natural birth, nor by proxy, nor by ceremony, nor by any overt act of the Church,—have come into fellowship with God in Christ, they do not regard the claim to ecclesiastical succession in any of its forms as a matter of concern to them. They acknowledge an historical succession from Christ and his Apostles; but its nature is spiritual, not ecclesiastical; coming through personal influence and the proclamation of the Gospel, not by means of forms, rites or ceremonies.

The same principle prevents them from admitting knowingly to Church membership any except those who have been spiritually renewed. Thus they cannot regard the children of Christian parents as entitled by birth or membership in a Christian household to a place in a Christian church or as proper subjects of its ordinances. It cannot be granted that the Christian ordinances of Baptism or the Lord's Supper convey in any sense to their recipients the spiritual grace which they symbolize, for they have meaning and value, only as they express the faith and grace already possessed by those who in these acts of obedience confess their relation to Christ. Hence the practice of infant baptism and the consequences which follow it are a fatal impediment to organic union between the Baptists and Paedo-Baptist churches. Hence also the impossibility of Baptists consenting to an alteration of the original mode of baptism, because without the immersion its representation of the believer's union with Christ in His death and resurrection, is lost. Further, the doctrine of the spirituality of the Christian church demands that it avoid all alliance with secular authorities. Such alliances have been fruitful of evil.

The Baptist belief in the immediacy of each man's relations with God and in the necessity of personal faith in Christ in order to salvation carries with it the rejection of all forms of church polity, which admit the spiritual distinction of clergy and laity or the subjection of the individual Christian to any spiritual authority but Christ himself. This does not exclude the necessary disciplinary function of the local church, but, in reality, carries with it the dignity and autonomy of that organization and its freedom from all subjection to a higher authority.

It is because of these principles which represent to them the Divine Will that the Baptists find it necessary to maintain a separate organized existence. In relation to these matters they can feel themselves under a Divinely imposed obligation to propagate their views throughout the world."*

The Baptist position against union is further shown in their attitude to the Lambeth Appeal for Reunion, as contained in the following pronouncement:—

Baptist Resolution, 1920.†

---

*_The Canadian Baptist_, Sept. 12, 1907; also _Baptist Year Book_, 1907.
†_Baptist Year Book_, 1920.

Re Lambeth Conference.

"The Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec expresses its hearty appreciation of the spirit of the Lambeth Appeal as shown in its fervent desire for Christian unity, its increased regard for conscience, its broadening brotherliness, its longing for the spread of God's Kingdom, and to that end the efficiency and influence of the Church. We appreciate at the same time quite as warmly and sincerely the loyalty the bishops show to what they believe to be important truth.

With much of what they say, so far as the letter of it goes, we find ourselves in substantial accord. We believe that God wills fellowship, our fellowship "with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ," and the fellowship one with another, in which it has its source and support. We believe, too, that the fellowship will be more impressive and influential for good in the world when it finds fuller expression in doctrinal agreement, in mutual love and sympathy, in purer lives and wider co-operation in carrying out the commission of our risen and exalted Lord.

We further believe that "the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of :--

(1) The Holy Scriptures as the divine record of God's revelation of Himself to man and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith and practice.

(2) The divinely instituted ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper as expressing in the corporate practice of the churches the fundamental facts of the Christian faith and experience.

(3) A ministry possessing the inward call of the Spirit and recognized and set apart by the Church.

At the same time, while thus largely agreeing with the form of statement, we cannot but recognize the fact that our interpretations of some of these statements differ widely.

For example, this statement of the preamble: "We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body."

If by the "Universal Church" in the declaration is meant the aggregate of local churches throughout the world, we could substantially make the statement our own, for we believe that the Scriptures make it quite plain that the early churches were composed of baptized believers, and we may use the term universal church in the class sense as representing all the local churches even though quite independent and owning no other Head than Christ.

If, on the other hand, the term "Universal Church" means the whole company of the redeemed or what is often called the invisible church, then the statement, in our judgment, would be ambiguous and perhaps misleading. It would on the positive side be true enough. But there would be the negative implication that baptism was as indispensable to salvation as faith. That we do not believe. Regeneration is not by baptism nor in baptism. It is by the Spirit in those who believe. Of that baptism by the Spirit, as it is called in I. Corinthians 12: 13, the baptism in water is the symbol and confession. As the one incorporates the believer into the mystical Body of Christ, so the other incorporates him into the visible Body, the organized church.

We differ, too, in practice, as to the act of baptism. To us (and the world of scholarship is with us) baptism is immersion. It was immersion, therefore, which our Lord commanded. Obedience is at once our privilege and our duty. To change the act to sprinkling or pouring is to lose the scriptural significance of the ordinance, for it pictures our union with Christ in death, burial and resurrection. It declares that we die to the life of sin and rise to a new life unto God. (Rom. 6. 4).

Further, the opening paragraph would naturally lead one to suppose that only believers should be baptized. That is our belief. The Church of England, however, practises not believers' baptism, but infant baptism. To us that is a serious and fundamental departure from the purpose of Christ. It introduces into religion the principle of proxy—a principle which has brought untold confusion into Christian thinking, and especially into current conceptions of the Church. "Each of us must give account of himself to God." Each must believe for himself; each must make his own personal confession in baptism. We should do all we can to bring our children to personal faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; we cannot believe for them nor should we usurp their prerogative of free conscious obedience to Christ's command. Scripture emphasizes personal responsibility and the immediacy of the soul's dealing with God. That fundamental fact involves the priesthood of all believers.

There are other matters, involved in these, on which wide differences exist, and which present serious difficulties to organic union—such as liberty of conscience, the independence of the local church, the voluntary principle, and the relation of Church and State. When differences strike in to the heart of things they make enthusiastic co-operation difficult, if not impossible, to conscientious souls. The failure of outward uniformity or union without the unifying power of the inner spiritual experience is made quite plain in the history of the past. Europe is a tragic illustration at the present hour.

At the same time we would affirm with all emphasis:

(1) We love all those who love our Lord Jesus Christ, and

rejoice in every token of advance in inward and outward unity.

(2) The way to closer union with one another will be by closer union of all with Christ and fuller obedience to His commands. Let us go back to the New Testament and discard all traditions and usages that are clearly contrary to its principles. In the one Lord, one faith, one baptism we will find the basis of union. In the Great Commission we have our task. We would appeal to all to unite in the Gospel it proclaims, the creed it enshrines, and the obedience to which it summons. Within such a union there would be room for many differences, but they would be the differences of the members of the body, harmonizing with one another, serving one another, and ensuring by their very variety the beauty, symmetry and effectiveness of the whole body."

The History of the Union Movement

C.

THE DIVERSIFIED POSITION OF ANGLICANS ON UNION.*

Anglicanism is not like Jerusalem. It is not 'a city that is at unity in itself.' There are all kinds of cross currents in the church circles. Accordingly it is not an easy thing to put on paper the exact situation of the Anglican position on the present Church Union Movement in Canada, which is naturally but a part of the larger Anglican vision of Church Reunion.

The Anglicans have unity with very great diversity within their own communion. In fact it is hardly an exaggeration to say that the Anglican Church represents now to the world her own "vision" of Christian Unity. In view of all this, all that can be safely ventured as to the attitude of Anglicans, as individuals, are a few general assertions:—

(1) Possibly the majority of the Anglicans in Canada believe in visible organic union.

(2) Many of them look with unreserved favour on the movement towards union among their Free Church brethren; though some, probably very few, and those containing among them still fewer of their leaders, desire to complicate the present efforts to attain union between the Presbyterians, Methodists and others, by entering into the negotiations now proceeding.

(3) Many Anglican clergymen, while entertaining a very tender regard for the Free Churches, and yearning for Union with them, are quite set in the determination that they will accept no scheme of Union which will make reunion with the Greek and Roman churches more difficult than at present. In a word their vision is the vision of a visible reunion of the whole Body of Christ on earth.

(4) It is almost unnecessary to say that within the Anglican Communion, so far as I have been able to ascertain,

---

*Source material for this study is given at the close of this Chapter.

there are numbers, considerable among the laity, to whom the previous remarks do not apply; one section containing few laymen with eyes only for Greece and Rome, the other containing fewer clergy with eyes only for the Free Churches.

(5) The evangelical Anglicans believe the best way to govern the church is through the Bishop, but not as the High Churchman does, as essential to the being of the Church. The evangelical type of Anglican theology prevents the possibility of union with the Roman church, whereas High Church theology prompts many of its advocates to warn against the danger of taking a narrow view of Union. They dislike the notion of a Protestant church and will have none of it. The extreme High Anglicans in the Motherland who face towards Rome are not a large element and may ultimately go over to the Roman Church.

(6) There is also I think an Anglican element that prefer union with Presbyterians only in Canada, or at least desire to negotiate through the Presbyterians with a view to union, rather than through the Methodists.

(7) There is also not an inconsiderable nor uninfluential number who deplore the possibility of the Presbyterian Church losing its identity, lest its particular and powerful influence for good be diluted by merging with churches of different types, however influential they may be. These favour Federation or Confederation as the best solution of our Canadian Ecclesiastical problems and needs. These men advisedly fear the One Big Church ideal against which the course of History clearly warns.

The Anglican official position is easy and definite to trace. It is as follows:—

In the year 1908, the three churches then negotiating for Organic Union, viz., Congregational, Methodist and Presbyterian, invited the Church of England in Canada to participate in these negotiations. The Bishops replied, consenting to the appointment of a suitable delegation, provided the three churches unconditionally accept as the Basis of discussion at the proposed conference, the Lambeth Quadrilateral. The joint committee was thus called on to "treat with us along the lines laid down by the Lambeth conference for the present year and to understand that no action agreed upon by the delegates can be binding on the Church of England in Canada until approved by the General Synod acting in full accord with the Anglican communion throughout the world." The fourfold condition of the Lambeth Basis included:

(1) The acceptance of the authority of the Holy Scriptures,

(2) the creed commonly called Nicene,

(3) the divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion,

(4) the Historic Episcopate.

"The three churches, while gladly recognizing the cordial and brotherly spirit of the communication from the Bishops, rightly or wrongly regarded this reply as assenting to a *limited* conference only, since episcopal ordination was insisted on as a necessary prerequisite. Thirteen years later, however, at Lambeth the Bishops modified their position, and now suggest the possibility of some form of mutual ordination."*

It was the united Anglican Episcopate at Lambeth in 1920 that sent forth the well-known "Appeal to all Christian people," and the Church of England in Canada in its General Synod at Hamilton in 1921 endorsed that Appeal and its accompanying documents,† which thus constitutes her official position. This Synod appointed a large and influential committee, representing every diocese in Canada to meet with representatives of other bodies, with a view to a better mutual understanding.

Certain things were laid down for preliminary acceptance: (1) The Holy Scriptures, (2) The Nicene Creed, (3) The two Gospel Sacraments,—Baptism and the Holy Communion, (4) A Ministry "acknowledged by every part of the church."

These preliminaries were laid down because it was recognized by the Anglicans that they are not free to do as they might think expedient in such matters, but that these are things which they hold in trust, and must hand on to future generations unimpaired.

---

*S. W. Dyde, "Church Union in Canada," (*Journal of Religion*, March, 1922).

†See Appendix VIII.

In accordance with the Lambeth Conference Report the General Synod felt it could not approve of general schemes of intercommunion or exchange of pulpits, or depart from the general rule of the Church that none but those episcopally ordained might celebrate the Holy Communion in Anglican churches; but it laid down conditions under which, with the sanction of the Bishop, those who are not episcopally ordained might be permitted to preach in Anglican pulpits.

It is convenient to remind ourselves again that the Union Movement in the Anglican Church officially contemplates something much wider than the reunion of the Protestant Denominations and looks toward the union of all branches of the Church, and an important step has already been taken by the Church of Constantinople in the recognition of Anglican Orders.

As for the Anglican position on the present Church Union Movement in Canada, the Church of England has made no formal pronouncement on the subject. It has stood aside from it as such, while at the same time has been all along and still is ready to welcome and consider any proposals toward reunion, on the basis of the Lambeth Proposals. Those of 1908 having been modified as to the fourth point of the quadrilateral, a Ministry "acknowledged by every part of the Church" being substituted for Episcopacy, as indicated above.

Certain reactionary stipulations by the Canadian General Synod (1921) as contrasted with the Lambeth proposals are found in the Synod's interpretations of the same as contained in the following official document. It is noteworthy that the Synod was divided on these restrictions, but by majority vote they were adopted. The particular point of difference is the more specific Canadian interpretation as to intercommunion or exchange of pulpits.

Resolutions of the General Synod on the Lambeth Appeal, October, 1921.

Message No. 4—Upper House.

1. The Upper House of the General Synod of the Church of England in Canada welcomes and adopts the "Appeal to all Christian People" contained in Resolution No. 9 of the Lambeth Conference.

2. The Upper House accepts Resolution No. 10 of the Lambeth Conference as follows:

The Conference recommends to the authorities of the Churches of the Anglican Communion that they should, in such ways and at such times as they think best, formally invite the authorities of "other churches" within their area to confer with them concerning the possibility of taking definite steps to co-operate in a common endeavour on the lines set forth in the Appeal, to restore the unity of the Church of Christ.

3. The Upper House also confirms the following Resolution No. 12 (B) (I) and (II) of the Lambeth Conference Report as follows:—

(I) It cannot approve of general schemes of inter-Communion or exchange of pulpits;

(II) In accordance with the principle of Church order set forth in the Preface to the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer, it cannot approve the celebration in Anglican churches of the Holy Communion for members of the Anglican Church by ministers who have not been episcopally ordained; and that it should be regarded as the general rule of the Church that Anglican communicants should receive Holy Communion only at the hands of ministers of their own Church, or of churches in communion therewith.

The Upper House also accepts Resolution No. (A) (I) of the Lambeth Conference as defined in the following terms:

"The Bishops of the Church of England in Canada will support the action of any Bishop who, provided there be no 'Canonical Impediment', gives occasional authorization to Ministers not episcopally ordained to preach in churches within his Diocese, and to Clergy of his Diocese to preach in the churches of such ministers provided that, in his opinion such ministers are working towards an ideal of union, such as is described in the Lambeth Appeal, it being clearly and distinctly understood that this involves:

A. The whole-hearted acceptance by such ministers of all set forth in paragraph VI. of the Appeal to all Christian People, which is as follows:

"We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of:

"The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal Confession of belief:

"The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ:

"A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole Body."

B. An expression of their approval of the ultimate acceptance of Episcopacy for the United Church.

4. The Upper House accept Resolution 12 (A) (II), which is as follows:

"The Bishops of the Anglican Communion will not question the action of any Bishop who, in the few years between the initiation and the completion of a 'definite scheme' of union, shall countenance the irregularity of admitting to Communion the baptised but unconfirmed Communicants of the non-episcopal congregations concerned in the scheme.

They define the meaning of it as follows:

"That by the words 'Initiation . . . . . of a definite scheme of Union', in Resolution 12 (A) (II), we understand the formal adoption by the authorities of our Communion, and of a negotiating Communion, of a scheme of union based on the acceptance of the Lambeth Appeal."

The above Message was concurred in by the Lower House. It thus became the action of the Synod.

The following is a brief summary of the negotiations that have taken place between the other Communions and the Anglican Communion since the meeting of the Lambeth Conference (1920). Soon after the return of the Bishops from the Lambeth Conference the House of Bishops of the General Synod of the Church of England in Canada directed the Primate to send a copy of the Lambeth Appeal to the heads of all the Christian churches in the Dominion. He did so and accompanied the Appeal by a covering letter from himself intimating that, after the General Synod in 1921, further action would be taken. As soon as possible following the meeting referred to (considerable delay was caused by the printers' strike which prevented the Anglican proceedings being published) the Primate sent to the heads of all the churches a communication to the effect that a Committee and a sub-committee on Reunion had been officially appointed by the General Synod, 1921, (mentioned above), and invited the other churches to appoint representatives to meet their committee and discuss the proposals on union on lines in harmony with the proposals laid down in the Appeal and Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in June 1921 passed a most cordial Resolution in response to the Primate's first communication but, through some oversight, which ought never to have occurred, this did not reach the Primate for nearly a year. The Primate forwarded his second communication to the meeting of the General Assembly in 1922, when, also a most cordial reply was received. This opened the way for the proposed conference and, during the meeting of the various Committees in Toronto and Brantford, in September last (1922), an effort was made to hold such a conference with the Presbyterian representatives. The Primate called together the Anglican sub-Committee on Reunion for that purpose, but owing to the fact that there was a desire expressed that the Anglicans should meet with representatives of the three churches which were negotiating for Union, namely, the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregationalist, and owing to the fact that the Methodist Church had not yet officially appointed delegates, the formal conference fell through. A meeting, however, was held informally between a number of representative Presbyterians and some members of the Anglican Committee when a discussion took place on what are known as the "Montreal Proposals" looking towards reciprocal ordinations. It was unanimously decided at that meeting that the Montreal proposals were premature and not feasible until negotiations had reached a much further stage.

The Methodist General Conference has since appointed a Committee to confer with the Anglicans, and the Congregationalists have also had an officially appointed Committee in existence for some time.

Such is the record of the proceedings which have so far taken place (up to Dec. 5, 1922), and the Primate is at present consulting as to what should be the next step. His personal opinion is that possibly it would be wiser to await the outcome of the negotiations now going on between the three Churches before taking any further action, in order to avoid the charge of intervening at what may be deemed an inopportune time. However, as stated, he is consulting others before coming to any definite conclusion.

It is aside from the writer's purpose to discuss the Lambeth proposals. Suffice it to say that despite criticisms of the same he considers it one of the noblest documents in history. But it may be that should definite action be taken on the Lambeth Proposals, marked differences of conviction within the Anglican Church will come to the surface. This however is a matter for the consideration of Anglicans.

Source Material for Study of Anglican View on Reunion.

1. *Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion, Holden at Lambeth Palace,* July 5th, to Aug. 7, 1920. (London Society For Promoting Christian Knowledge. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1920.)
   (*a*) The particular Encyclical letter for use in public services of the Church, p. 9.
   (*b*) The Report of the Whole Committee and the Appeal, p. 132 ff.
   (*c*) An Appeal to All Christian People from the Bishops Assembled in the Lambeth Conference of 1920, pp. 26-29.
   (*d*) Resolutions (X-XIV) adopted by the Lambeth Conference on the subject of union (except those dealing with particular communions), pp. 29-31.

Note: (*c*) and (*d*) are printed in Appendix VIII. "The action of the Lambeth Conference is, of course, merely an expression of opinion and has no binding authority. But that such opinion should have been expressed almost unanimously by the archbishops and bishops of the whole Anglican Church can hardly help having far-reaching results." (*Christian Unity, Its Principles and Possibilities,* Association Press, New York.)

2. "The Lambeth Conference and After," Comments of Some Church Leaders and of the Religious and Secular Press. (*The Canadian Churchman,* August 24, 1922.)
3. "Church Heads Welcome Call to New Unity", Messages from Religious Leaders on Lambeth Pronouncement. (*The Globe,* Toronto, Sept. 13, 1920.)
4. *Journal of Proceedings, of The General Synod of the Church of England in Canada,* (Hamilton) 1922. This is carefully indexed.
5. *Journal of Proceedings of Provincial Synods.*
6. *Journal of The Incorporated Synod of The Diocese of Toronto,* 1922. pp. 46 and 110.
7. *Ibid.* 1922, pp. 57-59.
8. A somewhat harsh criticism of the Sincerity of the Lambeth Proposals, (*British Weekly,* June 29, 1922).
9. A Reply to this by Dr. Carnegie Simpson (*British Weekly,* July 6, 1922).
10. See Bibliography (Appendix XI) for further Anglican literature relative to Union.

CHAPTER II.

The Motives For and Against Union

These motives are manifold, diverse, and mixed. Apart from the economic argument scarcely any two persons will give you the same list of motives. There is here as elsewhere in this movement considerable looseness of thought. The reasons for and against run the whole gamut from calm deliberation and profound spirituality to an illogical and emotional piety which at times may be described as fanaticism. When you ask certain Unionists if they have ever given really serious consideration to any other plan of action than organic union, such as co-operation, federation, alignment, and the like, they look disgusted and annoyed. Others cannot give reasons for organic union as being preferable to other less irritating solutions. Others give arguments for organic union, that have no bearing whatsoever, unless it be that they are very good motives for some form of co-operation on a large scale. Among the non-unionists there is represented all shades of theological opinion from ultra irreconcilable traditionalists to fairly extreme liberals. It is important to note that among the opponents of the present proposed union there are those who may be described as narrow sectarians in conviction, whilst others of them are so catholic and broad in their desire for spiritual unity that no mere fragmentary attempt at Union will suffice with them. They want all the churches in it or none. The majority, I judge, if not every last man opposed to the present Union, would however, favour some broad and statesmanlike plan of co-operation rather than the proposed merger of only three churches.

In presenting the motives for and against Union, I shall give with absolute frankness both sides of the question, as I have ascertained the facts from wide correspondence, numerous interviews, and whatever literature is obtainable from pamphlets, booklets, magazines, church papers, and the daily press. Let it be borne in mind, however, that the arguments herein set forth, are not mine, but are the expression of those who hold these respective views.

A.

MOTIVES FOR UNION STATED.

I. The Signs of the Times Indicating the Trend of Divine Providence are a Revelation of the Will of God in favour of Organic Union.

In support of this view unionists give as examples: (*a*) The Lambeth Appeal, (*b*) The Statement of the Commission on World Conference on Faith and Order as to "Union" Movements in various parts of the world:—Canada, United States, the British Empire, and the Foreign Mission Fields.*

Union, it is claimed, synchronizes with the general movements in society. "One of the deadliest charges against the church is that it has no living guidance and inspiration, that it is resting upon the dead past, and is guided by a dead hand. It needs to be reorganized in the light of modern demands. We should move with the advancing wave of thought."†

Organic unionists assert that they are rightly interpreting the signs of the times, and are taking the tide at its flood which leads on to fortune.

II. Organic Union is a fulfillment of New Testament teaching, and particularly the prayer of Jesus 'that they all may be one'.

"There is not a shred of justification in the whole New Testament for the existence of schismatic churches. The Scripturalness, as well as the expediency of union, is a direct inference from the teaching of the New Testament regarding the unity of the church."‡

"The advantage of being in accord with the will of Christ and the teaching of His apostles must exceed any incidental

---

*They quote *Christian Century,* Chic. Jan. 4, 1923, from Secretary Gardiner's Report.

†Methodist Union literature, Dec. 1922.

‡Prof. T. B. Kilpatrick, Knox College, Toronto, (Tor. Star, March 10, 1923).

disadvantages that may arise in the transition from an old order to a new."*

"Not to consummate the organic union proposal would be disloyalty to Jesus Christ and the clear teaching of the New Testament."

"A visible organic union cannot over fulfil the prayer of Christ. To assert unity and not to prove it, is worthless. It is a strange family life when its members do not eat at the same table, and when they pass each other on the street in aloofness of spirit. The world cannot see unity there, but unfulfillment of the prayer of Christ."†

III. Organic Union is Needed to show the World our Spiritual Unity.

"The reasons urged for continued separation show that we are not living in unity, notwithstanding assertions to the contrary. Though studiously veiled, our divisions show a lack of unity inconsistent with having one spirit and purpose and revealing schisms which should be repented of."

"The Canadian union of three denominations would be an example to the whole Christian world—the first movement of the sort in history. Our duty is to effect union where possible. The Church of Christ is being weighed in the balance, Movements in this plastic period will influence history, for a millenium."

"A divided church cannot speak with effect to a League that proposes to unite the nations, or for the production of such a League."

"Lip service paid to Christian unity, which balks at organic union, is superficial and not sincere."‡

"You must have an organic-union-front on spiritual unity in order to be powerful as a church, and to bring united strength to bear upon the problems of the day."§

"A number of struggling churches only multiplies the sense of weakness which the world perceives, and cannot give an impression of strength. The paramount impression such

---

*Dr. Hugh Pedley, Congregationalist (Montreal).
†Campaign Union Lit., (Dec. 1922).
‡Methodist Union Lit.
§Pres. Minister, Toronto.

division gives is lack of wisdom to co-ordinate spiritual activities."*

"The Church is Christ's body. I do not believe in having disjected members of that Body."† "Let us dismiss finally from our minds that Church Union is a mere merger of corporations, to be accomplished by skilful diplomacy and judicious concession. It is rather the high, holy sacramental task, of restoring the broken unity of the Body of Christ."‡

"There can be no doubt that the deepest root of the union movement is the feeling that religion ought to be the greatest of all unifying forces and should not be exploited in the interests of divisiveness. There can be no doubt that the vision that visited the minds of the early leaders of the union movement was that of the one true church of Christ, its Divine institution, its visibility and its function in the life of the nation. They sorrowfully recognized that the question of union with Rome was not above the horizon, but they dreamed at least that it might be possible to unite all other divisions in one comprehensive body, which could be at once Catholic and Evangelical."§

Union by piece-meal is on the way to ultimate universal reunion. "Union thus may come not by being staged, and not by observation, but quietly like the dawn; and the speed of its breaking will be in proportion to our faith in the communion and fellowship of man with man, and church with church, under the guidance of the Spirit of God."¶

IV. IT IS DECLARED BY UNIONISTS THAT THOSE WHO OPPOSE THIS OUTWARD CONFORMITY OF THE CHURCH DO THEREBY SIN.||

Nay, more it has been stated in effect that those who oppose organic union are alien to the spirit of unity. The latter charge is supported by such a question as this: "Is there anything better than Presbyterianism in the mind of the

---

*Methodist Union Lit., (Dec. 1922).

†Rev. J. W. Pedley, Congregationalist, Toronto.

‡From an Anonymous pamphlet, mailed me by Pres. Church Union Movement Committee, Toronto.

§Pres. Professor—Letter and interview.

¶Prof. Dyde, *Journal of Rel.*, Chic., March 1922.

||See booklet listed in Bibliography, Appendix XI, 6 (b) (2).

Lord?"* The former charge of sin, so far as I have been able to ascertain, includes: (1) Refusal to help in healing the rent body of Christ; (2) Unchristian caste distinctions with social deductions, race prejudice, and unwarrantable denominational pride; (3) Special mention is made of a "sin" poetically expressed in the familiar lines:

> "I do not like thee Dr. Fell,
> The reason why I cannot tell."†

Or in bold prosaic language we have it thus: "With many, probably the majority of anti-unionists, the real spring of their opposition to union is the feeling of superiority they profess to entertain toward Methodists morally and spiritually. This, of course, is sheer self-righteousness; and is exposed to the Divine judgment that follows upon pride. Also people who live in glass houses ought not to throw stones."‡

V. DENOMINATIONALISM IS OBSOLETE: THE TIME FOR CONSOLIDATION HAS COME, AND MUST NOT BE BLOCKED BY TRADITION, SENTIMENT, PREJUDICE, OBSCURANTISM, AND THE LIKE.

Denominationalism Obsolete.

"(The occasion of the division which occurred at the time of the Reformation, and at the time of the Wesleyan revival, was not of God, but due to imperfections within the church as it then existed. The same necessity for division does not now exist, but the contrary)." "The existing churches, each in turn, came into being in order to affirm some aspect of Christian truth or experience that was neglected or ignored in the religious thought and practice of the time. In the meantime, these churches have developed their own tradition. But it may be safely affirmed that Christendom has now run the whole gamut of special testimonies, and that the time has come for consolidation, for the fusing of the insight and the experience, the knowledge and the understanding that the several churches have gained into one comprehensive Christian

---

*Dr. Woodside, Brantford, (*Pres. Witness,* January 21, 1923); replied to by Dr. Cunningham, Welland, (*Ibid,* March 8, 1923).

†Hamilton Minister (Pres.).

‡Prof. Kilpatrick, Knox College (Tor. Star, March 9, 1923).

witness. Nor does the tradition of any church, however noble and venerable, constitute a valid argument against its inclusion in any experiment in Christian reunion. Rather, indeed, does the very wealth of its tradition impose upon it a special obligation to bring it into any movement for "the building up of the Body of Christ." ("Union will enrich the church by leavening it with special gifts of each participant)."

"The task of unity stretches far beyond the horizon of any living man. We are nowhere in sight of the time when the great Roman and Greek Communions will be included in a universal church. But the very remoteness of this final unity makes it imperative that we should here and now set about uniting whatever broken pieces we can find and get to fuse together."*

Miscellaneous Arguments Briefly Stated, Relative to the Aforesaid Point, V.

"Sectarianism is wrong, therefore we must have organic union." "The denominational mind is narrow and lacking in love. You cannot love people half so well if they go by another name." "Denominational differences hinder the work of Christ." "The modern historical interpretation of the New Testament did away with a good deal of the authority for strictly denominational organizations of one form or another." "Union will break down the barriers that separate us from our brethren."† "The horizon of the Church's thought and aims will be widened: and the standards of spiritual attainment will rise."‡ "Union will tend greatly toward the restoring of the religious consciousness of the Canadian people and will make the Church a much greater factor in their life." "This movement is feasible and right on account of the essential unity of spiritual experience in all the churches." "Nothing will be surrendered which is vital to the faith of any church."§ "All essential doctrines of the Presbyterian faith are to be found in the Basis of Union, stated in language more easily understood by the people of to-day. Everything that is vital to the Presbyterian system of Government is retained; Sessions; Presbyteries, Synods and General Assembly remain in the United Church, constituted in a similar way and with similar functions of government. The names "Conference" and "General Council" are substituted for Synod and General Assembly."* "Dissimilarities and incompatibilities are exaggerated by an uninformed imagination. Good-will is the only qualification lacking for Union." "The organization of Local Union Churches reveals a dwindling of denominational loyalties."† "It is claimed that "where co-operative charges have been formed on the Basis of Union, little opposition has been experienced."‡ "A realization that the differences in the older countries have no place in the freedom of this new country, calls for Union. There has always been a growing realization of the unity of the three negotiating churches in practical preaching and in Christian service. In a new country this has been emphasized by the continual movement of population, making the churches in the newer districts, both country and city, practically union churches, although with varying denominational names."§ "Our little Congregational Union must, and wants to, get into the swim of the big movement, or we will be submerged, since we number but a few thousand members."¶ "Those contemplating Union are not moved by selfishness, nor simply by the spirit of desiring the fulfillment of a contract. The motive actuating the negotiating churches is to give and not to get."|| "All recent unions (within the families of the respective churches), have been successful movements away from denominationalism in Canada." "The opposition to the aforesaid unions was more intense and wide-spread than to the present proposal for inter-denominational union." "The testimony of the deceased fathers of the Presbyterian and other churches is presented as a motive for union." "The denominational arguments

---

*Pres. Church Union Movement Com. Lit. (anonymous pamphlet). The bracketed words are Meth. Union Lit., Dec. 1922.

†Campaign Lit.

‡Principal Patrick (*Pres. Witness,* May, 1910).

§Methodist Union Lit., 1922.

---

*Extracted from Church Union Mov. Com.'s Catechism.

†Methodist Union Lit.

‡Drs. Manning and Brown, Meth. Home Miss. Dept. (Interview).

§Congreg. Official (private letter to me).

¶Congreg. preacher Tor. (private interview).

||Dr. Chown, Supt. Meth. Church (Interview).

advanced against Union do not commend or justify opposition to it." "To oppose organic union is to mobilize the timidities and prejudices of the people, rather than their charity and good-will." "Union will discipline people by preventing them or their ministers running from one denomination to another." "Many Presbyterians are willing to take all their interests into the United Church but unwilling to go into the Methodist Church at the request of a Federal Committee when allocating territory to respective denominations." "A united church has an advantage over a Federated Church in the matter of rapidity of action."*

"The union movement is practical. The doctrinal basis has nothing to do with it. The majority of our ministers do not study their Westminster Standards."† "The anti-unionists ought not to oppose union on doctrinal grounds upon which they themselves are not united."‡ "Scores of illustrations might be given to show that the organic union movement is non-doctrinal. An important implication follows logically from this which the reader will find discussed in Chapter IV, (21).

The Time for consolidation has come.

Union leaders claim that not merely is denominationalism obsolete, but the hour has struck for the consummation of the proposed merging of the three churches into "The United Church of Canada." They support their contention by some such declaration as the following:

"The Union movement has gained such headway that nothing can stop it."§ "Union is an accomplished fact."¶ "In Saskatchewan *the thing is done;* there is no going back on it, because it is *completed.*"|| *"Not to go on with* Union would be *treason* to our Presbyterian people, and *unfaithfulness* to the negotiating churches with whom we have entered into *contract.*"⊗ "We cannot go back without uttermost

---

*Union Lit. and interviews.
†Dr. Edmison, Pres. official, and Sec. Union Com. (Interview).
‡Prof. Kilpatrick, (Interview).
§Dr. Pidgeon, Convr. Union Com.
¶Rev. Mr. Pritchard, at Tor. Presbytery meeting Dec. 1922.
||Prin. Oliver, at Sir James Wood's banquet, Toronto.
⊗Dr. Edmison (Pres.) Sec. Union Com. (Interview).

confusion and reaction. Can anyone imagine how difficult the task would be to restore to the Mother churches that which they have surrendered for the sake of Union. That would be an impossible task, and refusal to unite would simply multiply the number of denominations in Canada instead of decreasing them, unless all who are in favour of Union organize on that basis."* "Each of the churches would be much more advanced to-day but for anticipation of union, the consummation of which has been so long delayed."†

All these statements, and similar ones not given have behind them the opinion or conviction, as the case may be, that co-operation or union has been so extensively put into practice "with a view to union," as to prevent any turning aside from the "policy of organic union." For example "Some facts," published by the Church-Union Movement Committee are these:

"The vast mission fields of the Church, and for the most part the rural districts, have endorsed co-operation in terms of union. The results are startling. There are now more than 1200 charges which have already established Union in some form or other. This has been particularly true of New Ontario and the Prairie Provinces.

"Between the town of Orillia and the city of Winnipeg, along three lines of railway, out of some hundreds of charges, there are now only nine Presbyterian charges; all the others have some form of union or co-operation.

"In the Province of Manitoba there are now 70 Presbyterian charges, as against 148 Union charges.

"In Saskatchewan there are 431 Union Charges. Only in eight cities and in 21 rural places are there purely Presbyterian charges.‡

"In Alberta there are 297 Union charges of one sort or another. The Methodist and Presbyterian Home Mission Secretaries state that in Canada already there are 3,000 preaching places in Union. The most competent observers give it as their opinion that these unions were formed in anticipation of a United church, and that whatever the older sections of the Church may do, these places will never again be operated along strictly denominational lines."*

---

*Methodist Union Lit.

†Dr. Chown (Interview).

‡Compare these figures with those in W. A. Cameron's letter in Chapter VII. He says there are only 32 straight Union charges etc.

It is important to note that co-operation has taken place in Sunday School publications, and where possible in college work.†

If Church Union is not consummated now—what?

Eleven answers are given by the Presbyterian Church-Union Movement Committee as campaign literature. They are:

(1) *It would be a grave reflection* on the Presbyterian Church and a demonstration that authority has departed from our Church Courts, in that they allow a minority to rule the majority.

(2) *It would be a set-back to Church Union* throughout the world, and a confession that human nature is incurably prejudiced and our Lord's prayer for unity hopeless.

(3) *It would be a grave reflection* upon those who initiated the movement. The names of Forrest, Pollock, Warden, Caven, Patrick, still influence many, and we would play traitor to the cause that was precious to them, and to those men, like Principal Grant and D. J. Macdonnell, who in prophetic utterances foreshadowed it.

(4) *It would be a very great shock* to the many union and co-operative causes in which thousands of our own people have joined in the expectation that they would become part of a United Church.

(5) *It would be a serious blow* to Canadian solidarity. Church Union, for the welding together of the people of Canada, has possibilities that have as yet been very slightly realized.

---

*Non-organic Unionists claim (as our discussion will show later on), that there are only 55 Independent Union charges in Canada, and that the above figure of 1245 union charges is entirely misleading in that hundreds of these are co-operative. The real confusion of figures I believe is due the unionists' interpretation that congregations, formerly worshipping separately, have begun to worship together.

†Information may be had from Dr. Edmison, Sec. of Union Com. as to the full extent of co-operation. (Confederation Life Bldg. Toronto).

(6) *It would be a devotion* to denominationalism which stands in danger of becoming disloyalty to Jesus Christ and the clear teaching of the New Testament.

(7) *It would mean that in a few years* the Presbyterian Church in Canada would be confined to the cities and towns. Its national significance would be lost.

(8) *It would mean a great national calamity,* the demoralization of our religious activities, and the loss of the confidence of the people who have entered union and co-operative churches.

(9) *It would mean that the congregations of the West will unite* eventually whether the parent bodies unite or not. The problem would then be how to salvage the wreck of denominationalism which resulted from the Assembly's own action.

(10) *It would mean that we are not worthy* descendants of men like Chalmers, who said: "What care I for the Church of Scotland only as an instrument to build up the Kingdom of God?"

(11) *It is a movement of the people.* As such it can only be guided; it cannot be stopped. The vast majority of the Christian people of the three denominations believe it is the will of God.*

It is often said by Unionists that "if Organic Union is not consummated, all that we have done co-operatively will have to be undone."†

Union leaders claim they have a sufficient mandate to proceed at once to the consummation of union.

"The Church has said Union, the Sessions have said Union, the Presbyteries have said Union, the General Assembly has said Union, the West needs Union, wants Union, and for them Union is inevitable...... Every part of the Church with a Home Mission problem needs Union and desires it. To trifle with the issue, to suggest that the action of the Church through its Assembly was not made in good faith and will not be carried out is to precipitate a disruption far greater than any man would care to contemplate."

---

*All these points are challenged by non-unionists as pre-suppositions. (Italics mine).

†Is this true? If so, why? What then are the implications as to our being so spiritually united now as to be ready for Organic Union?

The vote.

It is argued that the two votes taken in the Presbyterian Church were decisive enough,* and that a third vote is unnecessary.† The vote is fully discussed later in this book, so that for brevity's sake I do not dwell upon it here.

Disruption.

"Immediate action is opposed in the Presbyterian Church for fear of disruption. But if organic union is to come, why not now? e.g. Irish Home Rule." "Irreconcilable Anti-Unionists are now a very small minority, much smaller than the Church realizes, and their cause is given the appearance of strength only by the advocacy of conciliation by timid Unionists who fear the consequences of decisive action. There will be no serious schism in the Church if Unionists calmly and firmly stand by their convictions. A few congregations may vote themselves out of the United Church, but these will be very few."‡

The method of bringing about Organic Union.

(*a*) "The method of bringing about organic union has been along the line of least resistance."

(*b*) "The Church of Scotland Bill 1921 has given our lawyers the hint as to how to overcome legal obstacles."

The Proposed Legislation.

This has been described by Dr. Pidgeon as an "excellent bill for the purpose in view."§ Unionists bent on immediate consummation of the Organic Union Proposal for the most part do not publicly criticise the Bill; whatever may be their private judgment of it. A few moderate and judicious unionists are very much opposed to it; especially so without another vote of the people, for the reason that the Bill will throw their fellow Presbyterians, opposed to Union, into the United Church, and at the same time take away their rights and privileges as Presbyterians; for if they vote themselves out* not into Union, they will find themselves homeless from the ecclesiastical point of view, because the law if passed obliterates, for them, the church of their choice.

---

*See Chapter I, A. for figures, and Motives Against, for discussion of Votes.

†The Methodist and Cong. Churches are not asking for another vote. But in the Pres. Church many Unionists are asking for another vote, for ex., Hamilton Presbytery.

‡Union Lit. Meth. and Pres.

§Synod of Toronto and Kingston, 1922. (See Chapter VI).

The appeal to the state.

"Personally I regret the necessity of appealing to the State for legal endorsation; and if Union were being "forced by law," it could be only calamitous. Only in so far as it is our evidence of spiritual unity will it be of any value; and *if* the scruples, as well as *the rights, of those who think otherwise are fairly considered and guarded,* I see no room for bitterness. No ecclesiastical union has ever been unanimous at the time of its consummation. The unanimity comes afterwards by steady growth. I think that is what will happen now."†

VI. ORGANIC UNION IS A NATIONAL ENTERPRISE WITH ITS GOAL A UNITED PROTESTANT CHURCH.

"It falls to Canadians to build up a Church, and at last a single church, that shall be a true and living Body of Christ. This church will diffuse its own life and grace throughout this land and its people, absorbing it into itself and being absorbed into it—until at last there shall be in this abounding country a nation at which men looking shall say: *That nation is the Body of Christ; in that country the word is truly become flesh;* THAT PEOPLE is Jesus of Nazareth WRIT LARGE."‡

"The proposed Union is the first step towards a National Church in Canada."§ "This union will be a bulwark for Protestantism and a power in national politics."¶ "If anywhere in Canada Union is required, it is in the Roman Catholic, wealthy metropolis of Canada."*

---

*The obvious reason for framing the legislation in this way contrary to the pledge of the Winnipeg Assembly, e.g., that congregations be permitted to vote themselves in, is in my judgment not only thus to count the indifferents, neutrals, etc. on the side of Union, but primarily to support the hypothesis that the Unionists are legally the read Presbyterians, and therefore alone have rights, etc.

†Rev. Dr. Herridge, a Union leader, (Letter to me). (Italics mine).

‡Anonymous lit. from Pres. Church Union Com., Toronto.

§Pres. Unionist minister, Toronto.

¶See Dr. Chown's letter, *Christian Guardian,* June 28, 1922.

It is claimed we need a national church, as being "indigenous to the soil," just as "the churches of early Christian history were indigenous to the soil." "The most valuable feature is that it will be a Canadian Church, arising out of the experience of our people, adapted to their needs and committed to the solution of their problems, the heritage of the Gospel we have in common with fellow-Christians the world over, but we have also the heritage of the Canadian spirit and this will find in the new Church an expression and an instrument peculiarly its own. The Churches now at work in Canada have come to us from without. They sprang out of conditions strange to us, and were built up to deal with the circumstances and meet the needs of other lands........ Whereas the union movement aims at a church distinctively Canadian....... It is the greatest spiritual enterprise of one hundred years."†

VII. The Spiritual Argument for Union.

"The majority of the Church does believe that the denominational differences are incompatible with the expressed prayer of our Lord. The Church does believe that Union is the will of God, and that the performance of that will is not only its highest task, but its glorious destiny."‡

VIII. Organic Union is a People's Movement.

"Do not let anyone believe what I saw in the paper the other day, that this thing has been cherished by the clergy of the *West*. Nothing could be falser than that. It is a people's movement and you cannot stop it.

"How does it arise? Let us say that here is a new line of railway; some people come around, they worship first of all in school houses, three or four Presbyterians, a few Methodists, a few Baptists, a few Anglicans. They decide that

---

*Rev. Wylie C. Clark, Letter (*Pres. Witness,* March 8, 1923).

†Dr. Pidgeon, (Pres.), Convr. Union Com. (*Pres. Witness,* March 1, 1923); See six other Articles by him which comprise a series on "The Church Union Situation" in Canada. (*Ibid*).

‡Church Union Mov. Lit. 1923.

they will build, with their slender resources, a church...... "Lumping their resources together they build one church. That is how the thing arises, just as naturally as that. After they get their church they find that the necessities of the case have found them a far more excellent way; what they have is a parish, and back of it and through it and shot right through the whole movement is the profound conviction that the thing is in accordance with the will of God and of the expressed prayer of our Master."*

IX. The Economic Argument.

"Organic Union will save the Lord's men and the Lord's money." "There is no teaching in the New Testament which can be construed into a mandate to waste, either the Lord's men or the Lord's money."

Associated with this "main argument for Union" are considerations such as these:

(*a*) "Union will eliminate the spirit of competition so that we can admire the leaders of all churches, and feel that Canada is enriched by their activity."†

(*b*) "Manses would be more commodious, libraries more complete, congregations larger, and travelling curtailed by Union."

(*c*) "The number of colleges would be reduced from 16 to 8 with marked gain in the teaching power."‡

(*d*) "Union will strengthen the Church. For instead of anaemic and feeble charges; each dependent more or less on outside support, and each a constant drain on mission funds, you will have one self-sustaining church, with a well-paid minister performing a man's job."§

(*e*) "Union would help foreign mission work."¶

(*f*) "Union would help social service work."||

---

*Principal Oliver, (Saskatoon), at Sir James Wood's Banquet, Toronto, January 9, 1923.

†Campaign Union Lit.

‡Princ. Dyde (*The Journal of Relg.*, Chic. March 1922).

§Toronto Minister.

¶Rev. Mr. Donald, Pres. Missionary (India). See also pamphlet listed in Bibliograph, Appendix XI. 6. (b), (4).

||Ibid.

(*g*) It would also help to solve the race and language problem.

"The foreign, or as we now term it, the "New-Canadian" problem, becomes easier to solve. In the provinces of the West, British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, and also in New Ontario, the percentage of the non-English varies from 40 to 45 according to the province. Under existing conditions the new Canadians, finding no distinctively Canadian church, may be said to be encouraged to live off by themselves, and perpetuate on Canadian soil their European exclusiveness. Everywhere in the North-West can be found little Match-box churches, built by the English speaking, all poorly equipped, poorly heated, lighted, and ventilated, the congregation small and struggling, and the minister inadequately paid. It is a colorable proposition that many of these New Canadians will seek to attach themselves to a distinctly Canadian church."*

X. The Argument of Christian Expediency.

"The Presbyterian General Assembly has been unanimous in eliminating duplication. If, in the interests of economy, the Assembly can, with clear conscience, commit a section of say fifty miles of territory to the Methodist Church, legislating thereby every Presbyterian in that district into a Union Church, it would seem that no fundamental principles of Presbyterianism would be surrendered if the whole church were to enter such a Union.

"If in more than 3,000 preaching places, the Assembly, with a clear conscience, can give its approval that these should be Union, with the Mother Church's blessing, surely there is no fundamental principle at stake if all the churches should take the same step.

"If the Assembly, with a clear conscience, can effect co-operative union in the colleges of the Church, in the Rescue Homes of the Church, in the Social Settlement work of the Church, in the Literature of the Church, in the Religious Education work of the Church, it would seem that there is

---

*Prof. Dyde, (*The Journal of Relg.*, Chic., March 1922).

no fundamental principle surrendered if the whole church takes the full step into corporate Union.

"How would Union affect a city or town church which is well organized and fully equipped? Suppose such a church entered union, the proposed legislation would not affect one single person or organization within that church. It would not affect the minister, and if the church became vacant, it would not affect the method by which another minister would be called; it would not affect the length of pastorate, nor the Session, nor the Board of Managers, nor the church's representation in the Presbytery or in the General Council. True, its missionary money would go into the common missionary task of the United Church at home and abroad. All that the individual churches entering such Union would surrender would be the name Presbyterian, which was discarded in Scotland officially years ago. Individually and collectively they would retain the reality. But Union would enormously enrich the life of the Church, for it would remove all that set of motives and purposes that are necessarily associated with denominationalism, and that render the finest and highest and purest type of Christian spirit and Christian devotion impossible.

"It must not be forgotten that the General Assembly has declared that in entering into such a Union the Church is within her rights and perpetuates all that is vital in the Presbyterian doctrine and polity. She preserves her identity.

"The question which faces the Church is, will the Church, through her Assembly, do what she has twice said she will do, and will she do it now? What is the Church's duty? What is the Church's opportunity?"*

XI. ORGANIC UNION WILL BE THE FULFILLMENT OF A CONTRACT.

"The Honor of the Presbyterian Church is pledged to the consummation of Organic Union. Anti-Unionists protest against this, and say that they are not committed. This is true; on every occasion they have announced their determination to resist. But Unionists are pledged; the Church as a whole is pledged by the action of her Presbyteries and General Assemblies, as well as by the votes of her elders and members. In 1916, *and again in* 1921, *the General Assembly decided on Union as its policy,* and announced their decision to the other negotiating bodies; these other bodies accepted our decision and acted on it in ways that will cause them irreparable loss if we now withdraw; the Presbyterian Church could not, even if she would, repudiate her word of honor. Whatever the opponents of Union may say, this consideration weighs heavily on the consciences of many of us, and is in itself quite sufficient to justify immediate action."

---

*Pres. Church Union Mov. Com. (Campaign literature, 1923).

Is Further Conciliation Possible?

"If by conciliation is meant another postponement of the issue, or another vote, the answer must be, No. But if it means facing the inevitable in a conciliatory spirit, a thousand times, Yes...... But the desire of conciliation must not lead to further delay. Our own people in Canada can wait no longer. If we attempt to repeat the experiment of 1917, we shall make ourselves ridiculous in the eyes of the world, and force the negotiating churches to take the next best step." "The Assembly's Union Committee was definitely charged to carry out this policy of Organic Union, and "conciliation" must not be allowed to hinder the performance of the duty laid upon it, which is plainly set forth in the words: "To consummate Union *as expeditiously as possible.*"*

XII. Organic Union is Needed for Those Who are Coming to Canada.

"I have heard that thousands and millions are coming to these shores. Have we any CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAMME FOR THE FUTURE......We need a constructive programme tomorrow, not only for the West but for all Canada."†

A Catechism on Church Union in Canada.

This Catechism is being sent broadcast as union campaign literature, in preparation for the anticipated conflict of the

---

*Dr. Pidgeon, *Pres. Witness,* Feb. 8, 1923; and Church Union Mov. Campaign Lit. (Italics mine).

†Principal Oliver, Sir Jas. Wood's Banquet, Jan. 1923.

next Pres. General Assembly (June 1923). It also has as its aim the influencing of the people, with a view to reducing the number of congregations opposed to the Union Proposal. It reads thus:

Q. 1.—*When and How did the Church Union Movement Begin?*

A.—It began in 1899 by the General Assembly appointing a Committee to confer with representatives of other evangelical churches with a view to preventing overlapping in Home Mission fields.

Q. 2.—*What was the Next Practical Proposal?*

A.—In 1902 the General Conference of the Methodist Church proposed a measure of organic unity for all evangelical churches in Canada. Invitations were accepted to consider a Basis of Union by the Methodist, Presbyterian and Congregational Churches.

Q. 3.—*How was the Basis of Union Prepared?*

A.—It was prepared by a Joint Committee of the three Churches. Afterwards it was considered, analyzed and revised by the denominational sections meeting separately and again considered, amended and finally endorsed by the Joint Committee in full session.

Q. 4.—*How Long was the Joint Committee Engaged in Preparing the Basis of Union?*

A.—The work of drawing up the Basis of Union extended over a period of five years, and the Joint Committee finally approved it in December, 1908.

Q. 5.—*Is the Basis of Union a Departure from the Presbyterian Faith?*

A.—No. All essential doctrines of the Presbyterian faith are to be found in the Basis of Union, stated in language more easily understood by the people of to-day.

Q. 6.—*Is the Basis of Union a Departure from the Presbyterian Form of Church Government?*

A.—No. Everything that is vital to the Presbyterian system is retained; Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods and General Assembly remain in the United Church, constituted in a similar way and with similar functions of government. The names "Conference" and "General Council" are substituted for Synod and General Assembly.

Q. 7.—*Has the Church the Right to Modify its Polity and its Statement of Doctrine?*

A.—Yes. A majority of the Presbyteries having given their consent under the Barrier Act, the General Assembly is empowered to modify the Church's doctrine, discipline, government and worship.

Q. 8.—*Were the Presbyteries Consulted on the Basis of Union?*

A.—Yes. The Basis of Union was submitted to Presbyteries under the Barrier Act, and was adopted by them by a vote of 53 to 13.

Q. 9.—*Were the Members of the Church Consulted?*

A.—Yes. In 1912, and again in 1915, when the largest majority voting against Union was about one-fifth of the membership of the Church.

Q. 10.—*Does the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church Require that the Membership Should be Consulted?*

A.—No. In unions consummated in Scotland the membership at large was not consulted; but here, in Canada, it was thought well to know the mind of the membership.

Q. 11.—*Has the Procedure Toward Union Been in Accordance with the Constitution in Every Regard?*

A.—Yes.

Q. 12.—*When did the Assembly First Decide to Consummate Union?*

A.—In 1916.

Q. 13.—*In What Terms was Their Decision Made?*

A.—The terms were as follows: "This General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada do now resolve to unite with the Methodist Church of Canada and the Congregational Church of Canada to constitute the United Church of Canada on the Basis of Union approved by the General Assembly of 1915 and by the majority of Presbyteries since consulted under the Barrier Act."

Q. 14.—*What Provision Was Made for Legislation to Consummate This Union?*

A.—The Union Committee was instructed to obtain legal advice for the drafting of all necessary legislation, in conjunction with the Committees of the other Churches, and to "report to the first Assembly following the end of the first year after the close of the war."

Q. 15.—*Was Provision Made for the Protection of the Property Rights of Congregations That Desire to Stay Out of the Union?*

A.—Yes. The Assembly directed that legislation should include such protection.

Q. 16.—*Why did the Assembly of* 1917 *Decide to Delay Preparation of Legislation?*

A.—The General Assembly of 1917 decided to defer action looking toward legislation owing to the anxieties of war.

Q. 17.—*Has the Assembly at Any Time Reversed its Decision to Consummate Union?*

A.—No.

Q. 18.—*What Action Did the Assembly of* 1917 *Take Regarding Local Union Churches?*

A.—This Assembly adopted a definite scheme for co-operation and the formation of local Union Churches "until the Organic Union of the negotiating Churches is consummated."

Q. 19.—*When Did the General Assembly Next Take Action on Church Union?*

A.—In 1921.

Q. 20.—*What Was the Decision of That Assembly?*

A.—The Assembly resolved to "consummate Union as expeditiously as possible," and appointed a committee "to carry out this policy."

Q. 21.—*What Was the Next Step?*

A.—In carrying out the policy of the Assembly, the Union Committee, in conference with Committees of the other Churches, engaged counsel to draft legislation. Draft legislation will be presented to the Assembly in June, 1923, for approval.

Q. 22.—*Is Legislation Necessary?*

A.—The principle has been established that Churches have constitutional freedom of action in uniting with one another. When Churches have thus agreed to consummate

Union, legislation is sought in respect to matters affecting legal status and the transfer of property.

Q. 23.—*Will the Union Interfere With the Freedom of the Individual Congregation?*

A.—No. It is expressly declared that there is the same freedom of individual congregations in all matters of organization and practice enjoyed by them prior to the Union.

Q. 24.—*What Will Be the General Effect of the Union?*

A.—It will vitalize and co-ordinate the activities of the uniting Churches at home and abroad, and enrich the spiritual life and fellowship of Christendom, by abolishing the artificial barriers of denominationalism in the Dominion of Canada.

Q. 25.—*What Scriptural Warrant has the Church for Seeking Corporate Unity?*

A.—Our Lord's prayer for His disciples that they all might be one in Him, and St. Paul's conception of the Church as the Body of Christ.

Q. 26.—*What Then is the Obvious Duty of the Church?*

A.—To accomplish the high, holy, sacramental task of restoring the broken unity of the Body of Christ.

The Motives For and Against Union

B.

MOTIVES AGAINST UNION STATED.*

I. THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES DO NOT INDICATE THAT GOD DESIRES OR WILLS ORGANIC UNION. FEDERATION OR STATESMANLIKE CO-OPERATION IS A MORE REASONABLE DEDUCTION.

"The world movements to-day in spiritual affairs point decisively to Christian unity, co-operation, federation, or the like and not to organic union, of which there are but one or two minor examples in the whole world. There is and has been much talk of organic union but scarcely an iota of its concrete realization. Even the noble Lambeth Appeal, of the Church of England, for Reunion raises conditions upon which there is no likelihood of compromise, and is hopelessly too big a proposition ever to be workable." "It is a known fact that many bishops at Lambeth would have preferred Federation, and a minority report to that effect. However for the dramatic influence of their Church's speaking with one voice, they yielded to the Lambeth Appeal for Reunion. This appeal is diplomatically ambiguous in language."† "All that is best in the world is increasingly against tyranny, and for freedom, friendship, and peace."‡ "The assumption of divine right by a majority to coerce a minority into unity is not new; it was made quite sincerely by the Spanish Inquisition. We take issue with the proposition that any aggressive majority, even if there is an actual majority, has a divine mandate to forfeit the name, property and religious rights of a minority, or to use coercive methods and suppress discussion to secure uniformity."§

---

*Organized opposition to the Union proposal is confined to Pres. Ch., hence the arguments herein set forth are almost wholly from Presbyterians.

†A leader of the Church of England in Canada (private interview).

‡Dr. E. Scott, Editor *Pres. Record,* in public letter.

§Geo. F. Macdonnell, K.C., (*The Message*, St. Andrews Church Ottawa.) See also Chapt. VII; and Dr. T. W. Taylor's Article (*Pres. Witness,* March 29, 1923).

Federation Preferred to Organic Union.

Canadian Presbyterians opposed to organic union are alarmed lest the extravagant insistence upon this kind of union may check the progress of the world-wide and growing Christian unity, (in which the Canadian churches share), and thereby reaffirm disunion. This danger, it is claimed, would be avoided by Union of a federal or kindred nature:

> "*There are two possible conceptions of Church Union* which, for want of better words, we may call *organic and federal.* According to the one conception the church is pictured as a great unified organism. There is no Roman Catholic Church, no Greek Catholic Church, no Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Congregational church. There is one single church of which all Christians are members. There are divisions in this church, it may be, but they are such organic divisions as are found in an army. According to the second conception the united church is a great complex federated body. The distinction between Roman and Greek, Presbyterian and Methodist, Anglican and Congregational remains; but instead of competition there is co-operation in all matters that concern the building up of the Kingdom of Christ. There is a union of forces, a federal organism.
>
> "Perhaps the most notable instance of the former conception is the movement in Canada to unite organically the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational denominations. The latter conception finds its most significant expression, I believe, in what is known as the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, a federation which comprises nearly all the principal Protestant communions in the United States, and which although still in its infancy has accomplished wonders in meeting and solving many of the problems which have been vexing the denominational churches. Indeed, on the very side of church activity where sectarian divisions in the past have been most hurtful the churches comprising this Council have given proof of unity through federation.
>
> "That we must look for a union of the Christian churches along these lines rather than on a unity of organization, I feel convinced. We are never going to agree on uniformity of organization. All history is a protest against such an idea. There was a time when the church was united in an external organization throughout Europe, when there was one authority—the Pope, and one place of Empire—Rome. But it was a dreary time. It was a unity only in form for beneath the surface there were confused divisions. It is recorded of the Emperor, Charles V. that he was determined to make Spain, Germany and the Low Countries an example to all Christendom of uniformity in matters of faith. He bequeathed his policy to Spain. The result was the

Thirty Years' War and the final decadence of that country. Although he tried by the Inquisition to carry out his plan he failed completely. In after life, so the story goes, broken down by disappointment he resigned his crown and retired to a monastery where he amused himself by constructing clocks, which he found himself unable to regulate so that they would keep exactly alike for any length of time. If this teaches us any lesson it is that we must look for church unity along other lines than that of organization.

"Instead of organic union why not have a federation of churches the same as we have a federation of states? No one, for example, would think of suggesting that the nations formerly at war with Germany should merge themselves into one big nation. Even if this were possible it would not be desirable. So is it with our churches. I doubt if there is a serious problem facing the Christian church to-day which cannot be met and solved by a wise plan of co-operation.

"It is along these lines, I feel, that we must look for a closer union of the churches. Organic union, even if it were possible is not desirable for the reason that it destroys individuality and produces that uniformity which can be realized only in death. Federal union, on the other hand, leaves room for diversity, and diversity means life and power."*

The lessons of the great war do not favour Organic Union as a deduction from the signs of the times:

"The soldiers of nations united in the warfare in France were not compelled to think and speak in French, to adopt French laws and customs, to swear allegiance to a French president, or to have all their national property and rights made subject to the domination of one central power. So, in so far as principle goes, we believe that the Christian churches can and should work in harmony for the common cause, without losing their identity."†

"Robert E. Speer says that there has been a recrudescence of the denominational spirit in his land since the war. He says that when you come to examine the causes of this revival 'everyone of them turns into a ground of fresh confidence and hope'."‡

---

*Rev. Dr. J. K. Fraser, Galt, (*Christian Observer,* Nov. 1917).

†Geo. F. Macdonnell, K.C., (*The Message,* St. Andrews Ch. Ottawa).

‡Rev. Dr. Cunningham, Welland, Ont. (*Pres. Witness,* March 8, 1923).

Presbyterian Union Proposal in Scotland.

Canadian unionists point to the proposed union of the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland as a sign of the times in favour of organic union as a spiritual necessity. But "Dr. Denney in one of his printed letters says, in effect, that the vision of a great merger embracing all the churches in Scotland has no attraction for him."* Moreover the Scottish union proposal as yet is confined to Presbyterianism, and for this and legal reasons it is not an argument for organic union of different Canadian denominations.

II. THE HISTORY OF THE MOVEMENT IN CANADA IS AN ARGUMENT AGAINST THE UNION PROPOSAL.

A. *"This history has been too checkered and too narrow,* for the organic union scheme to be accepted as one of unadulterated Divine origin. Its leaders have been obsessed with *this plan to the exclusion of all others, none of which have ever been fully considered.*† The human hand, therefore, has played a large part in the Canadian Movement."

Some arguments given in support of this contention are these:‡

(1) The economic argument to save men and money, by co-operation in Home Mission work (1899-1902), was suddenly turned to one for organic union by Dr. Patrick's unauthorized speech to the Methodist Conference, 1902.

(2) "There was at that time opposition to Union, but little of it publicly expressed in the church at large, during the first eight years of the Union movement (1902-10), because:

(*a*) "Church Union and Christian unity were claimed identical. The reasons and arguments for the latter were urged for the former. Union was thus made a matter of moral obligation, and many who were unwilling to give up the Presbyterian Church were constrained to silence.

(*b*) "If any opposed Union in those early years there was an immediate reminder that it would not be courteous to decline conference on union, when invited by the Methodist Church, which officially inaugurated the movement.

(3) "A third cause of the consent in the Assembly was the additional promise that, the people would be consulted, and

---

*(*Ibid*).

†An examination of Pres. *Assembly Minutes* prove this. See Chapter VII.

‡Pres. Church Assoc. campaign lit. against Union.

nothing further done towards organic union unless there was practical unanimity (1905).*

"That statement stood as a pledge through six years until the first vote, 1911. Non-organic-unionists gave their trust to that pledge, and most of them took little care thereafter to oppose the negotiations for the union, for they knew that such practical unanimity did not exist.

"Then at the end of those first eight years there came, like a bolt from the blue, the recommendation of the Union Committee, or rather the members of it who happened to be at the Assembly in Halifax in 1910, that the Basis be approved, and sent down, not to the people to learn their will, as so often promised, but to Presbyteries under the Barrier Act, an official step towards Union, which disregarded the rights of the people, and went directly in the face of all the assurances that no such step would be taken until the people had given their judgment.

"That recommendation of the Union Committee was rushed through the Assembly with unfair and unseemly haste; for, in spite of strongest protest one hour only was given, after motion and amendment had been presented, for the discussion by the members of Assembly of so all-important a matter involving the very existence of the church, which had been so unexpectedly and so contrary to repeated promise, thrust upon them.

"Is it any wonder that men seeking light, and judging a question by what they see of the means used in its promotion, would say to this Union Movement: 'Thou savourest not the things that be of God but those that be of men.'

"That action of the Union Committee and of a majority in the Assembly met with strong disapproval, even among friends of Union; and the following Assembly of 1911, without any discussion sent it down to the people, where according to promise it should have gone the year before, instead of to Presbyteries under the Barrier Act.

"But did that make amends for the wrong of the previous year? By no means, for it went down to the church together with and influenced by that vote of the Presbyteries under the Barrier Act. Instead of a simple reference to the people to learn their will, it was a "loaded referendum" a virtual dictation, in so far as the Presbyteries could make it so, of what the church at large should do.

"What was the answer of the people? Of the 306.061 communicant members and elders at that date, 115,968, little more than one-third† voted for Union; nearly half as many others,

---

*This and other promises are ably discussed in a pamphlet entitled "A Breach of Faith in Church Union Proceedings," by Rev. M. D. M. Blakely, Pembroke, Ont. Oct. 16, 1922.

†38 per cent., or a ratio of 11 to 5 in favour of Union.

51,691, voted against it, and forty-five per cent. of them did not vote, expressed no desire for change.

"After the first vote in The Presbyterian Church, the Union Committee was called together and in its finding are these words: "The strong minority in opposition shows that Union is not possible at present," and they published that finding abroad as their recommendation to the Assembly, and to that finding those desiring to continue their church gave their trust.*

"The next Assembly met in Edmonton in 1912. The members of the Union Committee, who were present as Commissioners to the Assembly, held a meeting, the many absent members of the Committee having no knowledge of it, and adopted a recommendation different from that agreed upon at the full and regular meeting of the Committee, some weeks before, and looking directly towards Union and its speedy consummation, and they brought it before the Assembly as the recommendation of the Union Committee, and urged its adoption.

"That recommendation was not adopted. But the Assembly appointed a large special committee, which brought in a unanimous finding, enlarging the Union Committee to represent more fully both sides of the question, recommending co-operation along different lines, the cultivation of the spirit of unity, and the promotion of fraternal intercourse with other churches.

"There was effort made in that Special Committee to give prominence to Union, by having inserted the declaration that Organic Union is "a thing to be aimed at and striven for" but it was not accepted. The resolution was made unanimous, both in that Special Committee and in the Assembly by the assurance that we were starting anew, with an open field and a free hand, to consider not only Organic Union, but the brotherhood in its widest sense, and the best ways of furthering and giving expression to the unity desired by all.

"The next Assembly met in Toronto twelve months later. The majority in that Assembly did not keep to the agreement of the previous year at Edmonton, but decided to press Organic Union 'in the hope that it may be consummated without unnecessary delay.'

"That step, contrary to pledge and promise through the years as to the necessity of practical unanimity, contrary to the agreement entered into by all parties at the previous Assembly in Edmonton, showed that some were determined to press their one aim regardless of covenant or promise.

"Others had then no alternative but simply to say, for themselves and the many thousands like-minded, that while those who

---

*True to its promise the Assembly halted the movement, but expressed the hope of "practically unanimous action within a reasonable time." (*Assembly Minutes,* 1912).

so desired were free to leave the Presbyterian Church, and form a new one, others were just as free to remain; and they made their choice accordingly, and organized to that end.

"These men have been told that they had no right to take such a step, contrary to the mind of the Assembly; that it is intolerable in a democratic church that a minority should rule, or seek to rule; and at every meeting of the Union Committee and of the Assembly we have had elaborate arguments as to the narrow majorities which decide the issues in affairs of State.

"The cases are in no way parallel. Majorities both in Church and State apply only to government within that Church and within that State. If any number, more or less, wish to leave a Church or State and go into another, they are free to go, and any other number, more or less, are just as free not to go. We seek to rule no one. All have equal freedom in taking either course. The only intolerance is the attempt to compel men and women out of one church into another against their will.

"Further, in the decision of this question of Union, church courts have no place. The people elect the members of these courts, ministers and elders, to manage the affairs of the Presbyterian Church. But these courts have no right to go beyond that and to say to the people who elected them, 'We are planning a new church for you, and you are to leave this one and enter that new one.' These courts were not elected for such a purpose, nor authorized to do such a work. It is beyond their province or power, and no action that they may take in this direction is of any authority either in temporal or spiritual affairs."*

In 1915 the Assembly again and finally (thus far) asked for another vote of the people. The result was an increased opposition of 23,000.† This reduction is all the more remarkable since "college principals, professors and church officials took a leading part in union propaganda, including the publication of an important pamphlet to influence this second vote. This pamphlet contained inaccurate and misleading arguments.‡

"The next year (1916) the Assembly ignoring this greatly increased opposition of the people, as well as its own previous declarations as to necessary unanimity, re-resolved to proceed to union. ('The Assembly thus reversed its 1912 decision.' The Assembly should have said, the minority is greater and our previous decision stands, and then other methods of federation and co-operation with Methodists and Congregationalists would

---

*The above quotation is from a Presbyterian Non-organic-union pamphlet. See also "The Barrier Act," at close of Chapter V, and Dr. M. W. Taylor, *Pres. Witness*, March 29, 1923.

†i.e. a reduction from 38 per cent. to 32 per cent., or of ratio from 11-5 to 11-7, as compared with 1911 vote.

‡See Bibliography, Appendix XI, 6.

have presented themselves)."* In the Autumn of that year the "Presbyterian Association" organized, not to prevent the formation of a United Church, on the part of those who were in favour of such a church, but simply to see that legal steps might be taken to preserve the continuance of the Presbyterian Church. In view of this action, the Assembly "to avoid disunion among the membership of the church" again halted the movement. In 1921, without regard to the terms of its unanimous agreements in 1905, 1912 and 1917, and without taking another vote of the people the Assembly resolved "to consummate organic union as expeditiously as possible." Now overtures, strongly opposed, but carried, by substantial majorities, are being forwarded to the Assembly, which meets in Port Arthur this year (1923), to consummate union immediately. The large and influential Presbytery of Hamilton, realizing the unfairness of the proposal, as well as the certain calamity to the Church which will follow such action, has overtured the Assembly to refer the question to the people once more. Among other things, it feels that the change in membership (about 100,000 new members added) since 1915 necessitates another vote.†

B. *Non-Organic-Unionists are not Irreconcilably Insurgent.*

"In the light of these facts which are quoted from the official minutes of the General Assembly, I leave it to your readers to say who is responsible for the present opposition to union.

C. *The Proposed Legislation Introduces a New Issue.*

"The issue before the people at the present time is entirely different from what it was when the last vote was taken in view of the Bill, which was accepted by the Union Committee last fall, and which is to come before the next Assembly. The question now is not "Are you in favour of union?" but "Are you in favour of union on the basis of the provisions of the bill which abolishes the Presbyterian Church—her ministers, members, property, funds, (even her name)—and merges into a new united church, without even asking her communicants whether or not they are willing to go?" Has history any record of any act of *ecclesiastical Tyranny* that equals this? There are thousands of unionists in the Presbyterian Church, who feel very strongly on this question . . . *the people* who are *responsible* for the present unrest and agitation are the radical unionists who are insisting on the consummation of union on the basis of the Bill which is to be presented to Parliament, but which, I believe, stands little chance of being sanctioned by that body."*

---

*Dr. Nelson, Tor. Speech to Pres. Women's Assoc. (Tor. Globe, March 12, 1923).

†Chaplain Major W. F. McConnell claims 50,000 Pres. soldiers were overseas when the 1915 vote was taken and urges that they be not also disfranchised, but given a chance to vote. (*Pres. Witness*, Feb. 22, 1923).

Moreover "this Bill was drawn up by lawyers collaborating in the interests of 'the united church-to-be,' rather than by the Presbyterian solicitors acting impartially to explore and not to exploit the legal possibilities and problems."†

D. *The Policy of The Assembly Temporizing, Since* 1916.

Rev. Dr. Dickie interprets the much disputed phrase "as expeditiously as possible" as a temporizing plan.‡ He writes:

"The Assembly of 1917, confronted with an opposition to union which threatened the disruption of the church, gave the whole question a four years' hoist.§ The Assembly of 1921 took up the question again and out of regard for the peace and unity of the Presbyterian Church brought in a temporizing measure. I should know the purport of the resolutions respecting union in these two Assemblies, for I prepared them in subcommittee. The action of the Assembly of 1922 was also a temporizing measure.

"Every Assembly since 1916 which has touched on the question of union has shown itself keenly interested in the peace and unity of the Presbyterian Church. They have hesitated to carry out the resolution of 1916 because they did not wish to embroil the Church in strife and purchase union at the cost of a schism. But the Presbyterian Church Union Movement Committee, which of course has no official standing in the Church, has apparently made up its mind to pay the price of a prolonged strife and a serious schism in order that they may have union. They no doubt have a legal right to do so if they wish, but I submit that they

---

*Dr. J. Keir Fraser. (*Tor. Globe,* March 17, 1923).

†My gist of Prin. D. J. Fraser's Article (*Pres. Witness,* Jan. 4, 1923.) He claims this was contrary to the will of 1922 Assembly, See *Minutes;* also Chapters VI and VII.

‡(*Pres. Witness,* March 1, 1923). The phrase referred to occurs in 1921 Assembly's resolution on Union (See *Minutes*).

§Dr. W. Leslie Clay, seconder of 1917 Assembly's Resolution, pleads for another vote to fulfill the pledge of that Assembly to seek Divine guidance along the path of "the growing experience of the people, resulting from the war." Dr. Clay refuted Dr. Pidgeon's claim that "the guidance sought has been given" (See Dr. Pidgeon's Art. III, "The Church Union Situation," *Pres. Witness,* 1923). It is important to note that the 1917 Assembly determined on cessation of all union propaganda, during the truce of the war period. No action in detail as to union was to be taken, but broad co-operation was to be allowed. But during the truce church officials widely urged co-operation "with a view to union." This was particularly true in New Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan, where the leaders in the movement were strong unionists, and urged the people to accept the Basis of Union.

have no right to invoke the authority of the General Assembly for their project. On the contrary they are denying the policy of all the General Assemblies since 1916 which has included the preservation of the peace and unity of the Presbyterian Church.

"Admittedly the Presbyterian Church Union Movement has the power to put through union at the next Assembly, but at what a cost! It would seem to me the height of unwisdom to disrupt our own household of faith in order to unite with good neighbors."

E. *A Vote Demanded.*

In view of all these facts, many including moderate unionists and an occasional radical unionist, share in the urge for another vote, as recommended by overtures from Hamilton, and Barrie Presbyteries. For example, a college principal writes:*

"So strongly am I for Union that I favour Union with my anti-unionist brethren. I find myself opposed to factional methods, by whomsoever pursued, and believe that the result which will leave behind it the least sting, will be achieved by an agreement to make a deciding appeal to the people. Surely this view is possible for one wholly in favour of Union."

Dr. Clay writes:

"The path of 'the growing experience of the people,' cannot be traversed by using a magnifying glass from the high tower of one's own preconceptions, but by the more arduous method of another vote of the people, whose growing experience was deemed a factor in the guidance desired" (as expressed in the resolution of the 1917 Assembly.† The Assembly would act honourably and not stultify itself by so deciding.

Another Vote and Division of Property, etc.

"There is only one way out of our difficulty, only one. That is for the Assembly to submit this whole question to the people and Presbyteries, and appoint a Commission representing both sides to divide the property and equity of the Church equitably between them. Then can we say to the other:

"That thou residing here go'st with me,
And I hence fleeing here remain with thee."‡

---

*S. W. Dyde (*Pres. Witness,* March 15, 1923).

†(*Pres. Witness,* March 15, 1923). written in answer to Dr. Pidgeon, Convr. Union Com., who claims another vote is impossible and useless, on account of so many "union" charges now in operation, etc. (*Pres. Witness,* Feb. 22, 1923). My research leads me to a diametrically opposite conclusion. I believe a vote can, should, and must be taken. I think Parliament will demand it. The last vote was inadequate, and is now 8 years stale.

‡Rev. Dr. John McNair (*Tor. Globe,* March 17, 1923). My own judgment is that if a choice were given Presbyterians in the proposed vote between Organic or Federal union, the latter would carry by an overwhelming majority. Why not trust the people?

F. *New Policy of Unionists not to Consult the People, Condemned, and Constitutionality of Merger Proposal Denied.*

Unionists now claim it was only a matter of grace ever to have asked the people to vote on union. They maintain that the union proposal has been decided upon constitutionally by use of the Barrier Act.*

One writes: "Unionists claim the people and property of the Church, because they submitted the question under the Barrier Act to Presbyteries and received a majority. The Barrier Act never was drafted to govern union with other Churches, but to restrain hasty legislation of doctrine and polity. This attempt, when the Confession of Faith was drawn up, to impose uniformity on the Churches of Britain produced civil war and drove the Presbyterian Church from England and created the great Congregational Church. Moreover these very men who are screaming in our faces that we are not Presbyterians (who oppose union, but Congregationalists), themselves believe that the Barrier Act should provide for a vote of the people as well as of the Presbyteries. Let me quote the *Barrier Act of The Basis*: The General Council shall have full power to legislate on matters of doctrine, worship and government of the Church, subject to the conditions: First, that before any rule or law relative to these matters can become a permanent law it must receive the approval of a majority of the Presbyterians, and, if advisable, pastoral charges also. If the approval of the majority of the people ever will be advisable it is in our Church now. We are not mere legalists and the *Barrier Act is not a vaulting pole* to surmount moral and spiritual obligations.

"The Assembly made solemn covenants to safeguard the rights of any minority. Who is on guard? The only thing in sight is a band working overtime trying to destroy the minority. After they have done that why bother about providing for them? They pass the buck to a hostile and alien commission."†

G. *Organic Union Forces Avoidable Disruption. The History of the Movement clearly points to this disaster.*

"Organic union will mean disruption, and the fault will lie with the unionists, who are obsessed with organic union as the one and only kind of union and cure all. The Minutes of the Assembly prove that union leaders have deliberately refused to consider any other method."*

---

*This is denied. See "Barrier Act," and "Rights of the People" (Chapt. V, below).

†Rev. Dr. John McNair (*Tor. Globe,* March 17, 1923).

"Whatever be the outcome there is reason to fear that at least one church will be plunged into turmoil which many true friends of Christian unity think might have been, and should have been, avoided at this critical period in the nation's history. It is difficult to discern how the cause which both sides profess to have in view can be served by the formation of a new church organization born of strife."†

"The spirit of loyalty engendered by the history of our church and what she stands for in the way of righteousness in the building up of the nation, will be largely sacrificed and a hybrid organization formed which will take a generation to get into proper working order and harmony. During that time what disorganization will take place, and what valuable time consumed, and what great opportunities lost while the new church is drawing itself together, and *which in a few years may be split into factions over differences of opinion.* My advice is, 'remain as we are and work together more harmoniously for the common good in our particular ways.' As Dr. Robertson Nicol has said:—"If convictions are laid aside for the sake of union, we have not the unity of the church but the unity of the graveyard."‡

Organic union will bring civil war in the Church. "Union will be consummated as soon as necessary details can be arranged and enabling legislation secured." That reads simple enough, but in reality it means that the church is going to be in a state of civil war indefinitely. Neither a country nor a church has ever prospered in a time of civil war. And Lincoln was right when he placed the responsibility for civil war on those who were seeking to destroy the republic's integrity not on those who were defending and preserving it. Let us have peace and work."§

---

*Common argument against union. See also Chapter VII concerning no consideration to any other scheme (under argument from history).

†Toronto Mail, Editorial, June 17, 1916, commenting on action of Winnipeg Pres. Assembly in committing the church to union in the face of an increased opposition vote of 23,000.

‡Rev. D. A. Thomson, Clerk of Peterboro Presbytery.

§R. G. MacBeth, D.D., Vancouver, (*Presbyterian Witness*).

"The Presbyterian Church will continue. It will always be in demand by at least a large minority of our people, and by the influx of Presbyterians from other countries. It will be greatly diminished in numbers meantime especially in New Ontario and the Canadian West, but it will be intensified in spirit. With the growth of the country it will increase in strength and aggressiveness. Its preaching will be of the type that reflects strong conviction; many of the wealthy members will remain with the church and it will not suffer in the beginning for funds. When Presbyterians realize that the proposed enabling legislation if passed by Parliament (which is a matter of speculation) will be impotent to suppress their church, the tide may turn strongly against union. The union leaders' strategy will prove their undoing, for while no one can predict with certainty the ultimate results, non-unionists believe that thousands of Presbyterians will remain out of union and thereby prove their loyalty. Moreover, thousands among the minorities legislated out of their home churches by majority votes in congregations will be true to their religious convictions and assert their liberty by building new churches in all parts of Canada. Brains, money, conviction, strong character will guarantee to the continued Presbyterian Church peace, prosperity and mission expansion.

"Thus organic union will simply result in *another denomination* made up of the Methodist Church, the Congregational Union and a large majority of the present co-operative and local union charges in Northern Ontario and Western Canada, and possibly 50 to 70 per cent. of the Presbyterian churches throughout Canada.

"Non-unionists feel this would be a calamity, for it forces them in the interests of religious liberty into necessary competition with their brethren of the United Church, which might be avoided by a statesmanlike scheme of co-operation or federation, etc. Unionists, therefore, defeat their own professed aims of spiritual unity visibly manifested, by setting up organic union as the god we must all worship and by attempting to compel us to bow down before it. This is the tragedy of forcing the issue to-day in so narrow and stubborn a fashion. Unionists are making the mistake of counting the number of congregations, not the number of Presbyterian members who may remain out of union. This union is therefore opposed because it is an impossible and man-hastened affair leading to inevitable disruption. A new organization may be possible, but not the combination of these three churches into one organization for the Presbyterian Church will continue."* Not even 'iniquitous legislation' can kill Presbyterianism. "If after the consummation of union we have a Presbyterian Church not more than one-third of the present membership I know from the very nature of the people there will be a revival of religion, and a desire to do our best, and a sense of freedom because they would not be forced."

"The argument that the union movement was *born of the Spirit of God,* was met by a plea for the preservation of the unity that has existed among the 400,000 members of the Canadian Presbyterian Church. This Union (1875 the result of several unions) has been a good one. Why break it up? queried the speaker, amid loud applause."†

Disruption Avoidable by Broadening Out of Presbyterian Assembly's Policy:

"Non-unionists disagree with unionists that it is too late to change the Assembly's policy of organic union to a large scheme of co-operation, federation or the like. They maintain, further, that this would not be halting the progress of union, but that all that has been done would fit in nicely with the onward progress of a larger spiritual union that would be free from coercion, bitterness, multiplication of denominations, and the possible dangers of a big church that might run over into an autocratic hierarchy, as its membership and wealth increased with the inevitable growth of our young country. The more unanimous the consummation of the present union proposal, the greater the danger of a mighty church with its repetition of intolerance, persecution and materialism, against which the blood-stained pages of history warn us."‡

Two striking quotations, in support of the possibility of avoiding this calamitous disruption are:

(1) "Co-operation is the most significant movement that has

---

*Extracts from letters and speeches.

†Dr. Nelson, (*Toronto Globe,* March 11, 1923).

‡Gist of some private letters.

taken place. Owing to its co-operation the Methodist Church has been able to take charge of work in places where it would never have been able to go without the co-operative movement. This work ought to be carried on even if the church union is not carried out."*

(2) "If the Presbyterian Assembly should care to revise its opinions it has still power to do so, just as our last General Conference had; and if by any possibility it were to do so, we should accept its decision, and while deeply regretting that decision, we should still hold our great sister church in love and honour."†

H. *There are no Ethical Obligations Towards the Methodist Church to Unite in Forming a New Church Because*:

"(*a*) The Methodists officially began the movement, (See Chapter I).

(*b*) The General Assembly has never had a majority vote of the Presbyterian membership as a mandate for union.

(*c*) Both unionists and non-unionists have kept faith with what they believed to be right. 'The Methodist General Conference 1922, admitted that Presbyterians were not to be reproached for lack of faith.' "‡

"Surely no one will question the "good faith" of the Presbyterians who have always opposed the step as a backward one; who believe that Christ calls his people, not to union but unity; who believe that the Methodist and Presbyterian churches can do more for the Kingdom of God in Canada than could the proposed merger; who have consistently protested the disbanding of their church on the demand of only one-third of her membership; and have as consistently declared their purpose, in the meantime, to continue their own church, in unity and co-operation with all other evangelical churches.

"On the other hand a failure in "ethical obligations" towards the Methodist Church will surely not be charged to Presbyterians who have done their utmost to further the so-called union. If some of them in their zeal for it have overestimated their rights and powers, and have "resolved" to do what they cannot do, it is not a question of ethical but of physical limitation. If they made resolves which they cannot fulfill, the responsibility, such as it is, must rest with themselves but it is certainly not a lack of "good faith" towards the Methodists; and these Presbyterians might well have been spared the suggestion of such a thing, in

---

*Dr. C. E. Manning, addressing Meth. Gen. Conference. (*The Christian Guardian*, Oct. 11, 1922).

†Editorial (*Ibid*, Feb. 14, 1923).

‡Press reports of Meth. Gen. Conference, 1922.

view of their untiring efforts, through so many years, "in response" to the proposal of the Methodist Church.

(*d*) "Presbyterians who do not wish to be transferred to a new or different church control have no need to "withdraw", they simply continue their church."*

I. *A National Canadian Church Impossible and Undesirable.*

The history of the movement deals with only three negotiating churches. All other churches and sects are not in it. The Baptist Church will not enter. To this date there is not a shred of official evidence that the Anglicans will enter the kind of united church now proposed. In fact the present union if consummated will not hasten but react against a wider union. This is asserted because of its obvious man-made formation, its narrow doctrinal basis of compromises and things left unsettled; its conflict over "iniquitous legislation;" the difference of temper and convictions between the various denominations; the undesirability of a big church against which all history is a warning. These and many other reasons are given by those opposed to union.†

Unionists claim the history of the union movement is an omen of a great United Church of Canada. To this it is convenient to note the following reply:

"The unionists want to have in Canada what they call a United Church of Canada. Why, do you know that you have not that national type of character in Canada yet; you still bear the impress of the land of your fore-fathers; it is far too early to imagine that if you had this national church in Canada that the Methodists from the Middle counties of England, who are going to flock in here by the thousand, will find a resting-place in this nondescript church, this united church of Canada. Can you make anything else out of a north of Ireland Presbyterian but a Presbyterian? (Applause). Do you imagine that a Scotchman can ever forget the great stone on which our ancestors signed with their blood the covenant that has done so much for us? This, brethren, they tell us means a consolidation of the churches and would lead to the elimination of denominationalism; that means that there may be an endeavour on the part of some of us, if we can without sacrifice of principle stand alongside of

---

*Dr. E. Scott in answer to a letter by Dr. Chown, Gen. Supt. Meth. Ch. (*Christian Guardian,* June 28, 1922).

†I have scores of letters on file along these lines. The paragraph is but the gist of them.

these men in this movement; but it does not mean that; *it means mere division*; it means an added denomination; it means doing the very thing that they are professing to undo in this movement."*

Non-organic-unionists oppose the National Church scheme as reactionary. One unusually warm denunciation of this idea runs as follows:†

"A National Church—The Presbyterian Church has now to choose between an imperious Episcopal National Church and a nation of Free Churches. Those actuated by the law of the legal merger will drive their high-powered juggernaut through the Churches of Canada. Those who can be induced to ride may; those who will not they will scatter or grind beneath them. Disclaim as they may that this one would not be like the others, a child begotten, as this one, in the lust for conquest, with the inherited curse of cruelty in its blood and nursed on the breast of pride and tyranny, cannot be other than its ancestors."

III. Miscellaneous Arguments Against a "Big Merger Church".

(*a*) "A Merger Church might be as *merciless* as a big Trust." ‡"*Bureaucracy* now too prominent in the Presbyterian Church must be checked not increased by Union. We do not want superhuman officials to rule over us."§

(*b*) "*Denominations* check overhead authority, and safeguard us against extravagant, hasty, and ill-advised programs. Federation or statesmanlike co-operation means democratic moderation and the avoidance of over-hastened action."

(*c*) Organic Union reflects the *spirit of our day of mergers,* and tends inevitably to the *Commercialization of Religion.* A non-organic-unionist illustrates by quoting the words of Dr. Francis L. Patton, one of Princeton's most distinguished Principals.

"Much of the current talk of reunion seems to be forgetful of the spiritual values which are likely to be sacrificed for the sake of economic gains, and from a religious point of view, it impresses me as a chimerical effort to increase dividends by watering the stock. Whether this reunion is presented to us in the husky tones of trade, or in the wooing voice of pious feeling, I am disposed to regard the plea as insufficient and comfort myself with the thought that once when our Lord entered the Tem-

---

*Rev. Dr. Fullerton, (Pres. Convoc. 1916).
†Rev. Dr. John McNair (*Tor. Globe,* March 17, 1923).
‡Dr. T. T. Shields, Sermon (Tor. Star, Sept. 1923).
§Pres. Prof. (Private letter).

ple He overthrew alike the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold doves."

(*d*) "A Big United Protestant Church aimed at by unionists might cause *racial and religious* strife in Canada. French and English speaking Roman Catholics are our fellow citizens, and we must not molest their civil and religious liberty."

(*e*) "The Merger proposal produces fearful *forebodings.* The present strenuous Union campaign is a mild form of terror and *intimidation.* It has resulted in silence on the part of not a few ministers and a few professors whose intellectual, moral and spiritual convictions are all against organic union, but who meantime are afraid to speak, and are patiently waiting to see which way the wind of the union conflict will blow, before taking a decisive step, lest their livelihood and success be marred."*

(*f*) "The Big Church will produce *laziness* in the pulpit and *lethargy* in the pew. Healthy rivalry keeps people spiritually active."

(*g*) "Amalgamation will provide greater facilities for the growth of small *fanatical sects.*"

(*h*) "It crushes legitimate and desirable *freedom* of *choice and variety* which gives spice to life. Better allow this liberty than to unchurch people, even in rural districts."†

(*i*) "*Bitterness of present rivalries is grossly exaggerated* by union obsessionists. Organic union will increase competition in towns and cities by obliterating parish boundaries, so that a minister and his helpers may visit where and whom they will." ‡An illustration in anticipation of this, was the holding of anniversaries services by the three Methodist Churches of a small Ontario city on the same Sunday, March 18, 1923.

(*j*) "*The stereotyped resolutions of one big Church will be* much *less effective* in appealing to Parliament, for moral and social reforms, than a series of resolutions from various Free Churches."

(*k*) "The panicky argument that *Roman Catholicism* is outstripping Protestantism, is disproved by the Canadian Government's census statistics."

(*l*) "The Merger church built on a *"sandheap of compromises in doctrine and polity"* is a poor and paltry substitute for the great historic Presbyterian Church."

(*m*) "The proposed *obliteration of the Presbyterian Church* despite the protest of those who prefer it, by an Act of Parliament, is a high-handed, unchristian, and immoral *attempt to deny civil and religious liberty,* which no Parliament will sanction."§

---

*Confidential interview with a prominent professor.

†Rev. Dr. Nelson made the last three points quoted.

‡Dr. Cunningham (Interview).

§Pres. Convoc. speech, 1923. See also Chapter VI.

"The status of Presbyterianism in Canada to-day is very high. Its powers in spiritual matters preeminent. Its usefulness is still necessary, and is demanded by Canadians of all denominations. To stop its continuance by law, if that were possible, will be a national calamity. Its contribution will be diluted by merging with other churches."*

(*n*) *"To talk about carrying over into the new church, the protesting minority,* if it is a minority, is *irresponsible blindness.* The coercion of minorities by majorities is a species of force which should have no place in the Church. If we believe in the guiding and governing Head of the Church, does not divergence of opinion suggest that the solution of our differences is not yet in sight? The spirit of Jesus in His Church is more understanding and patient than the zealous followers of a great ideal. The modern Fellowship movements are giving us admirable suggestions of procedure. Grave differences of opinion are quite sufficient to hold up any decision. In corporate thought and prayer the mind of the Master will gradually emerge, and the ultimate solution will not be imposed on any minority, but will be recognized as the Will of God. To attempt to rule the Church by mere majorities when fundamental changes are proposed is dangerous and wrong. Shall we then expect the majority to forego their ideals in the presence of sturdy opposition? The answer surely is, *no.* When a man, or a company of men, believe they are out on a Divine quest, they will not feel that they are called upon to forsake the goal which they see so clearly, but it may be suggested to them *that if one way* of approach seems *barred,* it is, their highest wisdom to seek *another route."*†

(*o*)*"Unionists promise that all unsatisfactory and unsettled matters will be adjusted happily after union.* Get married first as churches and arrange all the matrimonial business afterwards. 'That is the price paid for accommodation and compromise. Give up what seems essential for the sake of this scheme of Organic Union. You need not give it up finally. Once let the new Church get established, and you can agitate to mould it to your mind.' What a contract!"†

(*p*) "If this Organic Union proposal is according "to *the mind of Christ*" (an assumption), then surely one Organic Church for all Christendom is according to the Divine mind. This is a tremendous assumption, and suggests an acquaintance with the mind of the Lord which frankly puzzles me."†

---

*Frequent argument. This is logically presented in Rev. Dr. Robert Campbell's book, *The Relation of the Churches.* (Wm. Briggs, Toronto).

†Rev. J. Herbert Rider, (*The Meth. Recorder,* London, Nov. 10, 1922), quoted by non-unionists as applicable to Canadian union proposal.

(*q*) "One result of the Movement called "Union" is a *large fruitage of fictions.*"*

(*r*) "All history is a protest against the argument of the moral, and spiritual *efficiency of the one big Church* idea, cf. Roman Catholic Church in Germany, France, Italy and Spain; and also the decadence of Protestant National churches."

(*s*) *"There is no whole-hearted enthusiasm of the Presbyterian people for organic union.* If there were such spontaneity, the present highly-financed organization for Union propaganda to win over the people would be unnecessary."†

"Mergence is impossible unless you have white heat enthusiasm. Union cannot be created by organization."‡ "The plain fact is that you must effect Organic Union not only by the rank and file, but on the insistent demand of a practically united people."§

(*t*) *Organic Union means disunion.* Its opponents, therefore, claim they are not "anti-unionists" but unionists of larger vision than organic-unionists.

(*u*) "The cry for organic union is raised in many quarters as if it contained the *solution of all our perplexities.* Yet many who were caught by it have *no distinct idea* of the advantages it is supposed to bring in, or of the principles in which it is to be carried through."¶

(*v*) "The private hint to non-organic-unionist *ministers* to *stay in the united church* after they have been legislated into it against their desire and convictions, on the assumption that congregations who vote themselves *out* of union will be numerically small, and that therefore ministers have a *better chance* in the big church of promotion and increased salary, etc., is materialistic and unworthy."

(*w*) *Organic Union means disloyalty to Ordination Vows.*

"Every man who strives to uphold the government of the Church by Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies, is in so far true to his ordination vows. All who do not are untrue to these vows. . . . They do not promise to be subject to an Assembly that acts unconstitutionally."‖

---

*Dr. E. Scott, See close of this section for 24 samples.

†Pres. "Anti-Union" Speeches.

‡Dr. Jowett, leader of Nonconformity.

§Sir Kingsley Wood, (*The Methodist Recorder,* Nov. 10, 1922).

¶*Christian Observer,* Nov. 1917, "Organic or Federal Union."

‖Extract from "The Message" (Anti-Union lit.).

IV. MECHANICAL UNIFICATION OF CHRISTENDOM IS NOT SUPPORTED BY THE NEW TESTAMENT OR THE PRAYER OF JESUS. DENOMINATIONS HAVE THEIR LEGITIMATE PLACE IN SPIRITUALITY.

"This argument is supported by world-famous scholars and preachers. For example:

(*a*) *Professor Denney* in his book "The Church and the Kingdom" used these words:—"The criticism of the church by those who have none but the papal idea of unity in their minds is beside the mark. It is not a sin that while some English Christians are Episcopalian, others are Congregational, Presbyterian, or Methodist. Unity of the church is not to be achieved by gathering all these into what the law would recognize as one entite morale; they may be one in the only sense which the New Testament cares for, without having one and the same legal constitution. They may be one in the unity of the Spirit, one in the participation in the same supernatural life, without being one in organization. The body of Christ in the New Testament is vitally one; all the members in it live in each other, co-operate with each other, share each other's joys and sorrows; but there is no such thing in the New Testament as one all inclusive Christian corporation. Varieties of organization are the necessary counterpart to the unity of the Spirit; the unity is shown to be real and effective in proportion as it subdues all these varieties to itself."

(*b*) So great a Christian statesman and Federate Church Leader as *Dean Shailer Mathews,* of the University of Chicago, has written:—"We do not believe that God's unity necessarily implies a unity of ecclesiastical administration in a single group. As we study God's nature and works we find infinite variety in nature, democracy in history, and trinity in theology. Unity of purpose, unity of trust in Jesus Christ with great variety of expression seems to us to be truly consistent with the conception of God's unity."*

(*c*) The famous preacher *Dr. Joseph Parker* declared:

"It is a common complaint amongst persons who do not look deeper than the surface, that Christians are much divided. They are only divided in outward expression; their *division, as compared with their union, is a small drop in the bucket.* He, therefore, will, in my judgment mis-spend his time, and will throw away his strength for naught who seeks to mechanise the Church. We have been vainly looking for union in uniformity, and because of the lack of this we have oftentimes most ignorantly mourned the absence of union.

**The Constructive Quarterly,* March, 1922.

"The Christian Church is split up into a score of sects, but the Church is one. When we seize that idea in all its range and significance, we shall not be seeking any mechanical unification of Christendom. . . . That view of Christianity receives no support from our Lord's Intercessory Prayer. We have no right to create uniformity and baptize it with the name of union. Christian unity is broken by the very existence of such standards. In our attempts to unite we actually disintegrate. Spiritual unity is the only unity that can permit and control honest diversity. This is my fundamental point. One star differeth from another star in glory; but the heavens are one. Differences in glory do not disturb the unity of the stellar church. If we had more of the spirit of Christ we would even rejoice in the differences that prevail among us, saying, Behold how large is the kingdom of Heaven! . . . Christian Unity is not formal but spiritual. . . . I do not ask for ecclesiastical uniformity, for we can never have it, though we may claim it."*

(*d*) "Moreover be it reverently said, that if the Bible did teach Organic Union, in that primitive age and land of peasants and the like, should we, of the 20th Century in a world gigantic in size and complex in nature and organization, adopt it any more than we should accept and use the agricultural methods and non-scientific knowledge of those far-off days of simplicity? I think not, and any argument to the contrary seems to me to be preposterous misrepresentation and unwarranted assumption."†

V. Separate Churches Preferable to the One Big Union Church.

When it is remembered that "Unity in Diversity" is one of the laws of nature found alike in the races of man, in the family circle, in botany, biology, by study of modern social psychology, without further multiplying instances, it can be no matter of surprise that there should be types of churches working together side by side in complete harmony.‡

These same studies, and other considerations, it is claimed, prove the advisability of separate denominations as preferable to organic union. For example:

A. *Biology does not favour amalgamation.*

"The fascinating theory is entertained by some that if the good qualities in the three denominations anticipating union were blended together we should then have in the new combination the stability characteristic of the Presbyterian, the fervour of the Methodist and the passion for freedom of the Congregationalist.

---

*Quoted more fully by "Orient" (Halifax Chronicle, March 1, 1923).

†Pres. Minister, Toronto.

‡Methodist Recorder, Nov. 10, 1923.

The teachings of biology do not support any such theory. Crosses between varieties of a species are always weaker than the parent stock, and in competition with the originals always go to wall, as is illustrated in Mendel's law, etc.

B. *The arguments from Nature favours co-operation not organic union.*

"The right way to regard the phenomena of life is not as a struggle for existence, but as a noble social fabric, made up of interdependent, co-operating elements, each contributing to the welfare of the whole. . . . And as variety characterizes all being, the great Architect having planned a curious and interesting ladder of life for both plants and animals, which, though conformed to general types yet show endless minor differences, so, is it in the realm of mind and spirit."* These last two arguments are then developed to show the desirability of denominations.

C. *An indigenous national church only a pretty theory. Separate churches are more influential.*

"It might be argued that instead of keeping up old traditional views of language, race and religion in this new land, it would be better to suppress them, and get people to forget their past, in order to secure solidarity and a Canadian sentiment and character. That is a very pretty theory; but though specious, it is not plain. Every man is the product of the past, and what will be the best for Canada will be that which will make the most of every individual in it. When each person is developed to the utmost, the sum of the accomplishments will make for the joint greater lives of the people. Consequently, considering how sturdy the principles and strong the will power of the Presbyterians of Scotland and Ulster are, the more of these that can be imbedded in the early development of the new Province of the Dominion, the better it will be for them; and neither the church nor the school will be neglected wherever the shorter Catechism is taught in the homes of the people."†

D. *The World and Church of the future does not call for Organic Union.* Dr. Chown states:—

"We cannot get a united world with a spiritually divided and broken christendom"—and again—"How can a divided church speak with good effect to a future united world."

---

*Rev. Dr. Robert Campbell—"*The Relations of the Churches.*"
†Dr. Campbell, *Ibid.*

In answer, Dr. Scott replies:—

(*a*) "Evangelical Christendom is not "spiritually divided and broken"—a charge so grave against the character of the Bride of Christ of unfaithfulness to Him, might be expected from her enemies, but from a Christian minister it is incomprehensible.

"All the world-wide co-operation and fraternal intercourse, the world C.E. and S.S. Conventions, the world Missionary Conferences, the world's Evangelical Alliance, the great Bible Societies, and thousands of more local unities, have been proving to the world for twenty, fifty, more than a hundred years, that Evangelical Christendom is spiritually one.

(*b*) "The 'future united world' which the world's best statesmen are seeking to bring in, the only possible 'united world,' is not a world under one central control, which Germany attempted in vain, but a world with its nations, large and small, self-determining living in amity and peace. Even the British Isles are dividing into smaller self-determining units, in the hope of a peace which could not otherwise be attained.

(*c*) "The Christendom of to-day is now united in the same way as the best statesmen are seeking to unite the world, churches larger and smaller, self-determining, living and working in unity, one in Christ.

"There are two ideals of the visible church on earth. One ideal is a great organization under one central control, be it Pope, Primate, Council, Conference, or Assembly, a great "religio-political" machine, an ideal impossible without compulsion, and ever more impossible as knowledge spreads and men are free to think and choose and act for themselves.

"The other ideal of the church is Christ's followers of every clime and name, organized as they may choose, but—with all their variety of form and name—one great brotherhood in Him; not a far-off impossibility but a glorious present reality, answering Christ's prayer and gladdening His heart; realizing even to-day something of the still gladder time when "every kindred, every tribe, on this terrestrial ball, to Him shall majesty ascribe and crown Him Lord of all."

E. *Presbyterians and the "Religio-Political" realm.* "Dr. Chown states:

"I would say with all conviction that if the major churches of Protestantism cannot unite, the battle which is going on for the religious control of our country will be lost in the next few years. I refer not to the school question only, but to the whole Movement within Canada in the religio-political realm."

"In that expression "religio-political" Dr. Chown gives his "conviction" as to what he expects and intends the proposed new church to be, a "religio-political" machine, incorporated as per the Basis of Union, for "religio-political" ends.

"Presbyterians may well be thankful for this frank declaration, and will have an added imperative to continue their own church, with Christ her "only King and Head," a church whose mission and work is not "religio-political," but to win men and women to Him, and then, as Christian citizens, will they do their duty in the State."

Dr. Chown replied to the effect that he had been misinterpreted, and that he "never thought of entertaining, as, for instance, that the United Church should not be a church, but a religio-political machine."

Dr. Scott rejoined:—"If Dr. Chown's words do not mean, as stated in my letter, that his ideal of the proposed new organization would be 'a machine to battle in the religio-political realm' will he kindly state what they do mean?"

To this rejoinder, I have not seen any reply. I have had many letters from Presbyterians, however, including unionists who will entertain no such motive for union. They feel that it would be very *reactionary to introduce State-Church or Church-State interference,* or anything approaching them. In this connection non-unionists disapprove of the asertion of a prominent unionist to the effect that "no Legislature would dare refuse to pass the proposed union legislation asked for by the vast majority of the three negotiating churches constitutionally expressed." One man asks if this is meant as a threat to Parliament.*

F. "Others again see in organic union a great political force working towards temperance, purity, and peace. All laudable objects whose consummation is devoutly to be wished, but which we believe can be obtained if the spirit of Christian unity truly pervaded us as a Christian people by a *federation* or alignment of forces."†

G. "*Separate denominations* are present in the world as mighty facts, and their *achievements are their justification.*"‡

"To claim that denominations may have been historically justifiable, but that there is no necessity for their continuance,

---

*Mr. John McKeen's letter, Halifax, Dec. 18. (Tor. Globe).
†Letter from Presbytery Clerk.
‡See Article by Dr. Cross, (*Amer. Journ. Theol.* 1919).

is a superficial catch-vote plank in the unionists' platform entirely unsupported by scientific investigation. It is also a denial of the Sovereignty of God.

H. "The guidance of *inner conviction,* or private judgment, inspired by the Spirit of God, with spiritual unity underlying it, when used collectively by the denominations, is much to be preferred to the *mechanical authority* of a mighty merger church of autocratic dictation and nondescript doctrine. The former seems God-made, the latter man-made."*

I. Presbyterian loyalty is not sectarianism. This loyalty a necessity.

"The Presbyterian Church has never been sectarian. It is a great historic and catholic church. Methodism historically has always been sectarian."†

"Many Presbyterians who cherish the sense of unity feel that in view of present conditions in Canada the best contribution they can make to whatever permanent and effective union the future has in store for them is to devote themselves amid the congenial environment of their own church to the actual work that church has at hand to do. This may be the result of native timidity or conservative temperament, but it is not necessarily sectarianism."‡

J. "Separate denominations create, inspire, and preserve Religious patriotism."

Tradition, sentiment, and the like are not to be mocked at. They still are mighty forces for righteousness. These are defended somewhat as follows:

(*a*) *Tradition Defended*:

"We can have no vision unless we have the appreciation of tradition; we can have no vision unless we have an historic perspective." . . . "The membership of the Presbyterian Church is something over 20 millions in the Pan-Presbyterian Council; we stand on equal terms in that large and splendid constituency. Have we any idea what a great part it has to play in moulding the destinies of the race? You may come from the barren Klondike and follow the sun as he travels until you return again and you will find the blue banner of the covenant floating in every land, or you will find everywhere an indication of the vital saving power of what we stand for in this convocation when we stand for the permanence of the Presbyterian Church. . . . This church will not be preserved in the proposed merger by blending its best with the best in the negotiating churches. History disproves such a claim. You know very well that in history we took the best out of the Greeks and the best out of Rome and we have incorporated them in our civilization, and where are they to-day? They are no more. That is what will happen to Presbyterianism if Organic Union comes—to Presbyterianism,—which Dorner has rightly described as the muscular system of Christianity. . . . We love the magnificent Methodist church, but we love our own church too, and we love her as she is. . . . Unionists say we are traditionalists standing for an old creed, and forsooth in the next voice they tell us that the whole of the old creed is incorporated in the new basis. The fact is the new creed is either a farce or a failure. . . . It is a nondescript affair."*

---

*Pres. Professor (Interview).

†Unionist Prof. Tor. (Private interview).

‡Prin. Fraser (*Harvard Theol. Review,* July, 1915).

"If by tradition there is meant in the church what is meant by it in the army and navy, then to be influenced by the tradition of our church means that we try to be worthy of our church, to be worthy of her best traditions, her martyr steadfastness, her mission aggressiveness, her catholic outlook. If this thing they call tradition means that, we are not alarmed at it. If they mean according to tradition, that we count it a duty and a right and honourable thing to teach what before God we promised to teach, and to defend and maintain the church, that we promised to maintain and defend, then we are quite willing to be called 'Traditionalists.'

"As for Traditional pride, we have a perfect right to a healthy share of it. Apart from the fact that genuine Presbyterians still feel that their doctrine and polity is nearest to Scripture they know full well that our church life, work and history occupy a lofty place in the minds of men the world over. We do not envy members of other communions having a share of pride for their own communions' standing and achievements, but we see no good reason to break the link in our grand traditions for the sake of an *imaginary big vision* of an Organic Church. Such an organic church as that proposed to us, with the Methodists and Congregationalists in Canada, is not worth the price of losing our identity as an integral part of the church of the Convenanters."†

(*b*) *Obscurantists*:

"But we are called obscurantists. It is charged against us that we are not progressive, that we are devoid of vision, in short, that we are a number of theological troglodytes, who cling blindly and tenaciously, and with unwarrantable persistence, to creeds outworn. There are in our ranks some who might be classed as conservative in their thinking, and others who might be called liberal. The Presbyterian Church, like every other church, is composed of men of different shades of thought, and it has been the glory of our church that it has been sufficiently catholic to permit the utmost liberty of thought consistent with adherence to the greatest essentials of Christian belief."

---

*Rev. Dr. Fullerton (Pres. Convoc. 1916).

†Dr. D. D. McLeod (Pres. Convoc. 1916).

(*c*) *Sentimentalists*:

"We are also charged with being sentimentalists. Frankly and unabashedly we plead guilty. We confess that the historic old Presbyterian Church, with its enviable and glorious history, does touch a responsive chord in our hearts. We sometimes take a secret delight in the achievements of those rugged men who dared everything for their obstinate convictions. We think with something akin to pride of the sturdy character which our church has produced, and we cherish the memories of those who in the early days of this country's life gave to it moral strength and stamina. This, of course, is all sentiment, a mere unsubstantiality, which ought to vanish like tinted mist before the demands of those practical men to whom the magic word "economy" means more than sentiment or honourable traditions. We wonder, after all, if there is anything in human experience much more powerful than sentiment. Why do we sing "God Save the King?" Sentiment. Why do emotions of pride stir our hearts at the sight of that emblem of liberty, the Union Jack? Sentiment. What binds our land to the Mother Country with a nexus so powerful that nothing can break it? Sentiment. Those ancient Jews exiled in Babylon, longing for the Hill of Zion, were largely actuated by sentiment. Alas, for the unsentimentalists."*

(*d*) *The necessity of Denominational Conviction and Conscience was proven during the war.*

"For a long time many of us may have been willing to recognize some undenominational expression of Christianity as sufficient, but we came to a sudden awakening in the war. It was realized then that *no undenominational expression of Christianity conserves the indispensable values.* It does not conserve the church values."†

(*e*) *Charge of Prejudice answered*:

"Criticism of opposition to union on the ground of its being an expression of prejudice is unfair. But granted prejudice is an element, only those who are not conversant with modern social psychology would make such a criticism since 'prejudices' go to make up the very fabric of social habits and customs and play a large part in the determination of ethics."

---

*Pres. Message. ("Anti-Union" lit.).

†Quoted by non-unionists from Dr. Robert E. Speers' address (*Community Programs for co-operating churches,* p. 223, Assoc. Press, N.Y.).

(*f*) *Presbyterianism should be continued because of*:*

(1) *Its congenial atmosphere*:

"Quiet, sane, profoundly spiritual, strong, intellectual, exalting. I respect Methodists. But the fact that we and they cannot use the same hymn book for a generation yet, alone proves differences of atmosphere. They prefer Wesley's hymns to the Psalms. The new hymnals show this acutely."

(2) Presbyterianism should be continued for the sake of *worship*:

"The informality of worship requires more consideration and more devotion. A modified liturgy is desirable. The Presbyterian Church has a fine opportunity to lead in this between the informality of the Methodist Church and the antiquarian formality of the Anglican Church. The Anglicans are showing a strong tendency to modify their liturgy." "There are differences in temper, differences in devotional trend, differences in ideals, and differences in method, differences in habit, and who does not understand what is meant when I say there is a distinct difference in devotional religion between the Presbyterians and the Methodists, and if we ignore these distinctions we are not capable of discussing this subject from the standpoint that will result in good to the cause of humanity; to ignore these differences is on our part to surrender the splendid heritage which we have in the church of which we may be proud, and in which each of us finds inspiration for greater things."

(3) Presbyterianism should be continued in Canada because of:

(*a*) Its *noble status*.

(*b*) It is *not a spent force*.

(*c*) The *certainty* of proved Presbyterianism is *preferable to* the *uncertainty* of the organic union experiment.

(*d*) Many *Presbyterians want* and will demand *their own church* as the best outward expression of their inward convictions.

(*e*) *Its theology and polity* are vastly *superior* to those of the basis of union.

---

*Space permits no more than the mere mention of a few arguments.

(*f*) An *indigenous* Canadian *church impossible* and undesirable.

(*g*) *Organic Union* is based on *pessimism* and lack of *faith.* Deep spiritual conviction not numbers count.

(*h*) Organic union is *unnecessary.*"*

These and other arguments lie behind the *religious patriotism* of non-organic-unionists as expressed in their sincere love and devotion to their own particular church.† It is very generally argued that organic union will tend towards the *adulteration* if not the *obliteration* of this precious denominational asset. "This is no time for scrapping these great church organizations, that it has taken centuries to build up."‡

VI. THIS UNION IS NOT ACCEPTED BECAUSE OF ITS BASIS.

To avoid repetition, I do not incorporate here criticisms on this. I have given these, together with commendations of the basis, at sufficient length and I hope judicially and honestly in Chapters IV. and V., on doctrine and polity respectively. The criticism of the basis of union is shared by both liberals and conservatives in theology, from their varied viewpoints. Only a few non-unionists, however, are indifferent on this point, whereas we shall see that in the case of unionists the indifference is so marked as to make it possible to describe the union movement as non-doctrinal.

VII. ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY A DUBIOUS ARGUMENT FOR UNION.

"The chief and practical reason urged for union is the saving of expense, avoidance of waste, and incidental increase of efficiency. Opinions differ, and the future alone can tell whether this will result; but our idea is that to make religion cheaper will not make it better; that commercial efficiency will re-place per-

---

*Titles of some Arguments set forth by Dr. Robt. Campbell, *The Relations of the Christian Churches.* (Wm. Briggs, Tor.).

†The writer in his vast correspondence and very numerous interviews with representative men of the three negotiating churches, found scarcely the faintest hint at denominational bitterness or prejudice. The arguments were other and loftier than that.

‡Rev. Dr. Winchester, (Toronto Star).

sonal religious interest; that the saving of expense will appeal to individual contributors; that it will be as difficult to pay one salary as it formerly was to pay two of the same size; and that a considerable part of our membership will, where no Presbyterian Church exists, go over to the Anglican Church, whose creed is similar to our own. Many instances of these occurrences have been given in public statements, although, of course, it cannot be contended that the experience is universal as yet."*

"The cry against overlapping and consequent waste of men and money in the West and in New Ontario as well as other portions of the country has been a supreme motive for union. This has been silenced by the formation of nearly 1,245 co-operative, federated, or local union churches, which have done away with practically all overlapping and saved men and money. It has been effected most happily with but few exceptions. There is no laudable or worthy answer why it should not be quietly continued in this peaceful and happy way. If we are not Christian enough to co-operate then we ought not to unite organically. It is *deceptive to claim* that these 1,245 co-operative charges *represent* 3,000 *union churches. Hundreds of them are co-operative. Scores of them are mere missions.* To claim that they could *not* have been formed *without 'a view to union'* is a partisan *assumption.*"†

"Economy may be pushed altogether too far. In so far as this is being done in the present union movement it is on a materialistic plan. It is not Christian. Jesus did not form His kingdom on the basis of economy or He would have made the community not the family its pivot point. We do unwisely to preach economy instead of sacrifice. Jesus Christ shed His blood to save us and the world. It is sacrifice that hurts we need, to call forth from our people, the life that will save them and advance the Kingdom of God. They are already too conversant with the materialistic motive of economy. We who are the real unionists not the disruptionists, by the way, have the lofty motive of sacrifice and yet more sacrifice. This is spiritual."‡

"The only argument the unionists have is that of economy. All the others are presuppositions. This one is materialistic and a reflection of the commercial spirit of our age."§

---

*Geo. F. Macdonnell, K.C., St. Andrew's Church *Message*, "The View of One remaining a Presbyterian." (Ottawa, Feb. 1923).

†Common argument, cf. also W. A. Cameron's letter in Chapter VII.

‡Rev. James Wilson, D.D., Tor. (Interview).

§Gist of Interview (Prof. T. Eakin, D.D.).

VIII. THE WEST DOES NOT NEED ORGANIC UNION. STATESMANLIKE CO-OPERATION OR FEDERATION IS SUFFICIENT.

The Western community spirit, if studied calmly and impartially, does not necessitate or warrant the Presbyterians of the West, (who number no more than three large Ontario Presbyteries) in their demand for organic union at the price of splitting the whole church.

The writer of this book begs leave to submit a letter addressed to him in reply to inquiries as to the Western community spirit in relation to co-operation, federation and organic union. The letter is from *Rev. Dr. W. D. Reid,* (now of Montreal), one of the noble pioneers in co-operation in the province of *Alberta.* I am not sure as to his position on the question of union, but the reader will observe that the letter as a whole may be used as an argument for co-operation or federation, if not in preference to organic union, at least as a possible substitute. The letter reads:

"Speaking of the movement started by myself while Superintendent out West, the first thing I did when I arrived on the ground was to visit every mission field in Alberta. Of course there were a few I did not get to, such as those away up in the Peace River district, but I reached about 95 per cent. of them. I found everywhere in Alberta, particularly in all the little villages and towns, two churches at least, the Methodist and the Presbyterian both struggling for an existence: often deep-seated quarrels, and jealousies going on between the two denominations, and both churches drawing heavily on the home mission funds of the respective denominations. After completing my first visit, I said to Rev. A. Mahaffy, Convener of the Home Mission Committee for Calgary Presbytery: 'This is a perfect scandal, a disgrace to Christianity, and a misappropriation of the mission funds of the people. We must get together.'

"He came with me and we interviewed Rev. T. Buchanan, Missionary Superintendent for the Methodist Church in Alberta. We laid the whole matter before him and he agreed. We then decided to call together all the conveners of missionary committees in all the Presbyteries and conferences in Alberta, and drew up rules and regulations by which we would *federate* the churches of Alberta. This was done and nine centres were selected in Alberta, where representatives of both churches met and reviewed all the fields in that vicinity.

"The two Superintendents were members of all those committees. Wherever the two causes were at work in competition, and either drawing missionary money, the problem was reviewed and one church had to go in with the other. Here it would be a Presbyterian who would be pulled out and there a Methodist. We tried to off-set one against the other. If a Methodist was taken out of one field a Presbyterian would be taken out of the next and so on, and the one first on the ground usually was left. (I imagine a copy of those rules and regulations, which were printed, could be gotten at the Home Mission Office). Not only so, but we divided up the sparsely settled territory and allotted it entirely to one church to look after. Sometimes giving ten townships to one church and a corresponding ten townships to the other. Well the result of all this was that in about three years there was scarcely any overlapping between Methodists and Presbyterians, where help had been required. Manitoba and Saskatchewan followed the same plan and later Northern Ontario. In fact the Home Mission Committee in Toronto secured our basis of co-operation and issued it almost verbatim to all Canada as its own.

"*Results*: So far as my observation went, they were exceedingly gratifying. Much money was saved the Mission funds of both churches. Many men were also saved to both Churches, and usually a much better feeling prevailed in the village or town. After a year's trial in Leduc where the Presbyterian cause absorbed the Methodist, delegates appeared before our committee. The speaker was a Methodist, and he said in effect 'Everybody is pleased with the change. We now pay our own minister a good salary. We draw nothing from either church, and a unity and harmony prevail in the town that we never had there before.'

"Often we had difficulty the first year or two, usually with some old stiff-necked Presbyterian (they were usually much stiffer than the Methodist) who would come to our meeting determined that a Presbyterian would be sent in again, but after a time the trouble calmed down. In some places some few hidebound Presbyterians would not go to church at all, but as a general rule it worked well. *To-day in Alberta there are but few causes that overlap at all, and these are independent ones.*

"You ask how it works in Mission fields? Usually splendidly. The majority of the peoples on the prairies are not strong denominationally, and if the gospel is preached by a good allround evangelical man, they care but little as to what denomination he belongs. Although when uniting each member is allowed to keep his name on the roll of his own denomination, and to give his mission money to that denomination if he so desires, this is seldom done.

"The feeling in the West regarding Union, I would say unhesitatingly, in the minds of the common people on the prairies, is strongly in favour of union. Many of those people come from the United States and have no hard and fast affiliation. The Scotch people prefer their own brand of religion, but they are usually glad to get any good service from any denomination.

"You ask is it a movement of the people or the leaders? I would say as far as the mission fields are concerned it is a movement of the people. But usually where you find a North of Ireland minister or a Highland Scotch minister he is dead against it and very often his congregation votes with him. In somewhere over three hundred preaching places in the West, union has broken out in spite of the leaders.

"You ask for the different kinds of union? In Alberta most mission fields are in one church or other, Methodist or Presbyterian. But in Saskatchewan and Manitoba many have broken out into union and have not federated with either denomination, and they call their own minister as suits themselves. There are over three hundred such places in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. They have their own conferences and yearly gatherings just as the other denominations. I suppose they might be called Congregationalists.

"You ask why Alberta and British Columbia are not so strong on union? I believe it is because of this policy of *federation* that they do not feel the need of union as do some other places." (Italics mine throughout letter).

The facts outlined in this letter seem to me, at this crisis of our church, to demand an honest consideration of plans other than that of Organic Union. In further support of this I quote letters* from two eminent Westerners:—

Rev. F. D. Roxburgh, Presbytery Clerk, Edmonton, *Alberta,* writes:

"Many good people vaguely dream of a happy condition in which brotherliness shall prevail, and this they imagine organic union will bring about. They have not thought it out along practical lines, and really realised the experience of religious fellowship with people of different type, and outlook. It is usually for other people that they propose this change. I know some ministers, who theoretically advocate union, but hope that practically it will never come in their time.

"The *great motive* prompting the crowd, that is the church people who are nominally Presbyterians but not very much in earnest about their faith, is *economy.* Economy of money. It is easier to pay one minister two thousand dollars than two men fifteen hundred each; and economize in the amount of sacrifice required in the service of Christ. They want enough semblance of religion to be respectable but not an amount that will tax them too heavily or interfere with their material interests or pleasures. My contact with *union churches* leads me to believe that they are *drifting towards* being *Community centers,* in which the *social* side of life is emphasized, and there are *no vital principles of religious conviction* for which they stand. You understand the depth and sincerity of the man who says "all churches look alike to me." This whole union movement looks like a *compromise with irreligion,* an effort to adapt the church, to superficiality along religious lines.

---

*See also Rev. W. A. Cameron's remarkable letter in Chapter VII.

"*Manitoba and Saskatchewan* have gone overwhelmingly union. They have *thirteen varieties of union* churches with almost 600 congregations. Possibly the character of the *population,* 50% non-Anglo-Saxon, and the *cosmopolitan* nature of every community, made union organizations almost inevitable. In addition the church *leaders* of these provinces have unconsciously *led* the way because they are almost all *union* men. They would claim that the people compelled them, but from experience I know that the *people respond usually* to the convictions of their leaders.

"Alberta and British Columbia are 60% union and 40% against. "I believe I belong to a group of men out here who have held up the *stampede.* Our attitude has had its influence on the rank and file, and further these two provinces have a larger Anglo-Saxon element, not taking into account the orientals who are not concerned." (Italics in letter, mine).

"In Alberta we have followed a *thorough system of Cooperation* for the last eleven years. The whole province has been divided into nine local districts under a provincial committee all of which meet annually, and this work has covered the entire Province, and has *eliminated overlapping so that you could not save men if you had union to-morrow,* and maintain the present scale of work, as all town ministers have *country work adjacent* in several different settlements. The result is that we have *not more than half a dozen real union churches in Alberta,* while Saskatchewan and Manitoba where they have not stressed co-operation and have encouraged union churches, the union movement has got out of their hands and now they don't know what to do with it and want to stampede the whole church to help to solve their own problem."

Or again, I ascertained the following opinion from a prominent leader, which is at least thought-producing:

"The community spirit in *the West* is not notably characterized by deep spirituality. Rather is it one of *restless* change, part of the spirit of the age and stressing itself in the West. In these provinces we have a slight *touch of ecclesiastical Bolshevism,* in limited areas, encouraged to some degree by leaders who appear to have an *obsession* for the cure-all of *organic union.* There are many kinds of Union churches in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. A goodly number of these cut loose from the parent bodies. It is a question, therefore, if they would abide by any polity of a united church. Large numbers of our Western people are without church traditions, and creeds do not matter with them. *Unfortunately* too there is a Western element who have the *idea that the East* is *not only unsympathetic* towards the West, *but actually* has been *exploiting* that part of the country. They are unduly *sensitive,* also, to Eastern criticism. That is an unfortunate *misunderstanding,* for we all have the welfare of the West at heart.

"Moreover since overlapping, (a main argument for union at one time) has now been reduced to a minimum, and practically eliminated especially in the West, organic union is not needed. It should also be borne in mind that often outlying churches are part of the *village parishes,* and these *must not be neglected* through over-zeal for union. The motives for union savour of materialism."*

The writer finds it hard, from a judicial not partisan point of view, to believe that organic union is the only possible solution for the West and that it is an unqualified movement of the people. I base my judgment not only on the above quotations but on wide correspondence and interviews. I have found further no readiness on the part of the ardent Western unionists to consider any other scheme than organic union. In fact a prominent unionist informed me that "Federation had never been discussed to his knowledge in the West."

IX. ORGANIC UNION IS OPPOSED BECAUSE IT IS UNNECESSARY.

"Unionists cannot show, along any line, that organic union can accomplish anything which cannot be as well and more widely attained by spiritual unity, manifested through federation or statesmanlike co-operation. All this is possible without the losses that must result from attempted pressure to bring about uniformity."† For example:

(1) *It is not necessary for Christian Unity.* This has been discussed in points IV and V of this section B (Chap. II).

---

*Private interview. Italics mine.
†Pres. Non-organic-union Lit.

(2) *It is not necessary for the Colleges.* In fact some claim that co-operation is going too far in this regard and weakening our theological training by accommodation and compromise. It tends to break up continuity of instruction and to give a scattered and undigested effect to theological scholarship.* "Nor is this college co-operation necessarily with a view to union. It is simply the co-operation on the ground of expediency of four independent self-governing Divinity Schools. It is an outward expression of the mutual good-will which is a tradition of this collegiate group, a witness to the public of the non-sectarian character of theological scholarship, and an effort to avoid the waste of overlapping, for example, in class-work and library equipment. What the future has in store for the movement—in the way of union or federation or of larger recognition by the University of theological courses in its requirements for degrees—is a thing of pure conjecture."†

(3) *It is not necessary for Home Missions.* The Western situation has been discussed under point VIII., of this chapter and in chapter VII. Non-unionists claim the same arguments are applicable in the older rural communities. Only *two main arguments* are given *against Federation* and they are: (1) *Lack of rapidity* of action, (2) Presbyterians do not want *to be made* Methodists and *vice versa,* in allocated territories. *Both* of these, non-unionists claim *may be overcome;* the former by an emergency committee seldom needed, the latter by double-affiliation. It is further argued against organic union that the *straight union charges* are *not a success* economically or spiritually."‡

"As one who has spent twenty years in Home Mission work and who has attended every meeting of the committee for the last eleven years and who has also been a member of the union committee, I believe that the true course is to develop the widest possible *co-operation* among all the Protestant churches in Canada; less talk about union and more living, working Christian unity in the local community and in the local efforts of the several churches is what we need. This must be based on a recognition of the possibilities of all the churches to provide a Christian ministry for all the people. Such an attempt by our *Anglican* brethren would be of much greater value than the *Lambeth Appeal* for Re-union, on the basis of Episcopal re-ordination etc."*

---

*I learned this from Professors of more than one college through confidential interviews.

†Prin. Fraser, (*Harv. Theol. Review,* July, 1915), in referring to co-operation of Montreal Colleges.

‡See Rev. W. A. Cameron's letter, Chapter VII; also, Dr. Banks Nelson asserts he has the word of a Western College Principal to the same effect.

(4) *It is not necessary for Immigrants.*

"The proposed union is not necessary for British immigration. Both the English Methodists and the Scotch Presbyterians will be retained in the Christian church in larger numbers by having a familiar church home to bid them welcome.

"The proposed union is not necessary to meet the needs of foreign immigration. The work among foreigners must be done from centres in any case. Let the churches divide the territory, each church taking its own centre and giving them the Gospel of Christ. Merging the churches into one big organization cannot increase their resources nor lessen the number of foreigners to be evangelized."†

(5) *It is not necessary for Social Service and Evangelism.*

"To have to break up three denominations to get the ministers of these to act with ordinary Christian courtesy to one another, shows how far these ministers are from being ready for union, and how absurd the idea that binding them together would fill them with Christian charity. The Christian spirit shown through co-operation (or federation) is all that we need; and it will call for a wider response because it invites all churches to co-operate, and not just the three negotiating churches."‡

(6) *All present successful co-operation may be continued without "the partisan with-a-view-to-union."* Common sense and statesmanlike leadership of a high spiritual quality can arrange this, by honest endeavour.

(7) *It is not necessary for the Canadian Foreign Mission work of the Negotiating Churches.*

"The proposed union is not necessary for foreign missions. *None* of the negotiating churches have foreign missions *in the same territory.* Further, the proposed united church would have all these foreign missions to care for and

---

*A Western Leader against Union.
†Pres. Church Assoc. Lit.
‡Rev. Dr. D. D. McLeod, Appendix XI, 6, (c).

would not be so strong to carry them on, for by no possibility could all the strength of the three existing churches be brought into a new combination."*

"On the basis of interviews and correspondence with the Canadian secretaries of the foreign mission boards of both the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches I may state authoritatively and accurately that 'we stand largely alone according to the comity of missions so that such unions as are taking place here would not be practicable in the foreign mission fields for geographical reasons. There are some exceptions where different missions operate in the same centre as in Canada, and in some cases the same kind of antipathies prevail.' But the exceptions have nothing to do with the missions of the Canadian negotiating churches nor even of the Canadian Anglican or Baptist missions. In other words, there is *absolutely no overlapping of our Canadian Foreign Missions,* and therefore 'the results of Organic Union would be negligible.' "

"Of course it is well known that there is a striking example of organic union of non-Canadian churches in South India, and a movement among certain Chinese against denominational churches in China (See Edin. World Missionary Conference reports; Shanghai Conference addresses and Commission Reports, May, 1922). But all this has no bearing on the Canadian church union movement. Besides our missionaries do not preach denominationalism and even our Presbyterian Church in Honan, for example, is not called by the name Presbyterian, but 'Jesus Church.' "

"A few of our missionaries are opposed to Organic Union, and the missionaries of the United States, especially the Presbyterian have strong advocates against union.

"Hence it is misleading and inaccurate to stress Foreign Missions as a motive for union. Anyone who doubts this statement may investigate for himself. An analysis of the geographical location and the system of comity of our missions will confirm my judgment based upon official information."†

"Evils might be aggravated by combining Mission staffs, trained in different schools and methods, and Mission committees each anxious to carry out its own system."‡

X. ORGANIC UNION IS OPPOSED BECAUSE NO OTHER SCHEME HAS EVER BEEN SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED.

Therefore, non-organic-unionists conclude, "we have a larger vision of Union; it is that of a federate or large co-operative kind. This will avoid the inevitable friction, division, scandal and loss that will follow the consummation of the present union proposal. Let us be done with this lesser thing, based on assumptions. Let us get together on another scheme that is spiritually and practically efficient and sufficient."

---

*Rev. Dr. McLeod, See Appendix XI, 6, (c).

†The results of my own investigation, condensed.

‡Rev. D. D. McLeod, Appendix, XI, 6, (c).

Let us have One Music: "One song, but many voices—for the truth and the love of God are broader than the measure of man's mind—and there is no understanding of the manifoldness of the Divine, except through the perpetual ministry of the voices that differ. In divers tones and in many ways God fulfills Himself.

"No one has ever yet had the temerity to propose a merging of the soprano and the bass. You cannot build a choir in that style. You will ruin your orchestra if you do not keep your strings and winds apart. Amalgamation spells destruction. There is no merging of the great, final and inviolable essentials either of music or of faith. You can associate them, but you cannot merge them.

"It is here that you come on the final reason for the existence of the churches. They are the 'instruments' in the orchestra Divine—they are the voices, each of them different, but each of them necessary—for it needs the variety of human experience and human appreciation to tell the wonder and the marvel of the Triune God. With all kinds of differences between them—difference in blood and discipline and temper and time—yet it needs them all to tell out to the world just what God is. How should we have known Him as we know Him to-day had it not been for the way by which He led our fathers? Blot out of the sight of the world the church which stands for the "Great Sovereignties" of religion and life, and it is only a matter of time when these essential facts will be distorted or forgotten. Recall them. There is the Sovereign Will of God; the Sovereign Headship of Jesus Christ; the Sovereign Authority of the Bible; and the Sovereign Rights of the people redeemed by the Cross. It is these tremendous and final things for which the Presbyterian Church stands, and it is the surest instinct that rules our hearts to-day, as it is the heart of our opposition to any course on the part of the leaders of our church that would bring the visible existence of that church to an end.

"We do not contend that these great 'sovereignties' are not known and believed by the other churches. God forbid. But we do say that these great 'sovereignties' make up the distinctive witness which we have to make before the eyes of the world and in the ears of men. The choir has but one music to sing—but each of the four parts of the choir has its own notes to produce;

so is it with the choir Divine—and the world will be poorer if the voice of age-long Presbyterianism is merged in the voice of any other, no matter how rich and true that voice may be.

"It is for the sake of these 'high harmonies' that we take our stand against the destruction of our church. For the sake of them we make our appeal to our brethren to keep their place by our side. Of one thing we are assured. It would be difficult to find a day in any age of the world's history when the 'Great Sovereignties' were more needed in the heart and mind of man. Therefore we dare not falter now. 'For such a time as this,' the Master puts this 'song into our mouth.' One with all who have named the Great Name in spirit and in truth—one in the bonds of the deepest and most lasting—harmony—we would join with all in the churches to sing 'one music as before.' "

Some Fictions on "Church Union."*

One result of the movement called "Union" is a large fruitage of fictions; there are fictions old, fictions new and fictions of the West. Herewith are two dozen samples:

1. There is the fiction that "Church Union" is settled; the Assembly has decided it, and the only thing now is to accept it. Pure fiction! The Assembly is not the master, but the servant of the church, appointed to legislate within and for the church, but with no more right or power to vote away the autonomy of the church or transfer it to another control than has Parliament to hand over Canada to the U. S. A.

2. There is the fiction that "all constitutional steps have been taken," when there are no "constitutional steps" of any kind in the Presbyterian Church for its own disbanding. All who wish to withdraw are free to do so, but all the "constitutional steps" of the Presbyterian Church are for its own continuance.

Further, everyone charged with the care of those "constitutional steps," every minister and elder, is pledged to that continuance; pledged by his ordination vows to "maintain and defend" "this church"—and every minister, each time he is inducted into a new charge, is pledged anew to "this church," to its "doctrine," "government," and "worship," to "adhere faithfully" to it; to "maintain and defend" it, and "to follow no divisive course from the present order established therein."

3. There is the fiction that it answers Christ's prayer, when Christ never prayed for organization, but for unity of spirit among His followers. Christ never taught that His Church should be one in name and type, and that a few men should have the right to decide that type and impose it upon others. He re-

---

*This campaign article was written to the press by Rev. E. Scott, D.D., Editor of the *Presbyterian Record.*

buked the Apostle John for attempting such a thing. (Mark 9, 38-39).

4. There is the fiction of "the majority vote of the people," when only one-third of the people voted for "union," and no one ever knew in Canada so unjust a thing as a great organization disbanded or transferred to another control on the demand of one-third of its membership.

5. There is the fiction that "union" is necessary for work in the West, when committees in co-operation have already eliminated all needless overlapping in Home Missions.

6. There is the fiction that "the West is solid for union," when thousands in the West are against it, and some of its strongest opponents are in districts where they have seen its enforced working.

7. There is the fiction of the host of "union" churches already formed, when all these are simply the result of co-operation one parent church withdrawing here and another there, to prevent overlapping; and when nearly all these so-called "union" churches are now allied with one or other of the parent churches, and are free to choose any church connection they may prefer without rending to pieces the whole church all over Canada.

8. There is the fiction that more mission work would be done, as if two pints would make more than a quart, with a large part spilled in the pouring together; and when the very attempt to force it is now killing our mission funds.

9. There is the fiction that it would promote Christian unity, when it has thrust into the Presbyterian Church in the past dozen years more division and strife than has been between all the denominations in all Canadian history.

10. There is the fiction that it is demanded by the young—when the students of Canada, formerly organized as a part of the Y.M.C.A. have within the past two years, separated and withdrawn themselves, and formed the Student Christian Federation of Canada, which held recently its first National Convention in Toronto. The students—as do Presbyterians—demand religious liberty.

11. There is the unworthy fiction that this movement is opposed because of "prejudice." It is opposed because of the conviction that is not of God, nor for the good of His Kingdom. It is opposed because, to exchange the democratic Presbyterian Church, pledged by ordination vows to Evangelical truth, for an autocratic, legal corporation, pledged to no system of truth, would be a long step backward in religious freedom and progress.

12. There is the fiction that this movement is an example to the whole world of the Spirit of Christ, when the only spirit shown by it to those of its own household in the Presbyterian Church is a spirit of callous disregard of the scores of thousands

who seek to coerce no one, whose prayer is to be allowed to remain in peace in their own church—a spirit of supreme indifference to its own past pledges as to necessary unanimity, and, as shown in the "Church Union Bill," a spirit of ruthless purpose, at whatever cost, to wipe by law "the Presbyterian Church in Canada" off the page of Canada's future history, and to drive her people into a new legal combine or out into the wilderness, without a church home. It is a spirit of which Presbyterians have not had such experience since the days of Claverhouse, and which now, as then, will fail. Freedom still lives.

13. There is the fiction of the name "Church Union" as applied to the attempted coercion of men and women into a legal Corporation by Act of Parliament. It is not "Union." It profanes that goodly name.

14. There is the fiction—worse than fiction—of "three thousand union congregations" when from Official Reports of District Superintendents all over Canada there are only fifty-five Independent union charges.

15. There is the fiction that "Union is in the air"—that it is "The tendency of the times" when all that is best in the world is increasingly against tyranny and for freedom, friendship and peace.

16. There is the fiction that "a Denominational Church can never give the Gospel to the world"—when Denominations have given to the world all the Gospel the world has ever received, and when the proposed new Church would be only another added "Denomination," but of a degenerate type, born not of conviction but of compromise.

17. There is the fiction that because the Churches worked together during the war they should now be under one control. Nations fought as one for freedom but are British, French, Italian still. Churches wrought as one, Protestant, Roman, Greek and Jew, but that is no reason why Presbyterians should be robbed of the freedom for which the war was fought.

18. There is the fiction that "those who do not vote are held as acquiescing"—when any schoolboy can see that this rule is for the Courts of "this Church," within "this Church," for her ordering and maintenance, and not for her dissolution.

19. There is the fiction—"Policy of the Church" as applied to the attempt of the Assembly to disband the Church. The Assembly is not the Church. The Church is the membership who compose it and support it and not the few who serve the Church and are supported by it; and who, in this attempt are exceeding their Constitutional powers, breaking their ordination vows, and usurping the peoples' liberties and rights.

20. There is the fiction that if Union be not consummated, Western Canada will break off from the East; fiction most ab-

surd! Presbyterians from Sydney to Victoria will continue, in unity and brotherhood with all other evangelical Churches, all of them golden chains from Ocean to Ocean. Moreover the fifty union churches in the West have already formed an independent body, but they have not had the slightest effect upon Canada's solidarity.

21. There is the fiction that to drop the Movement for Organic Union would imperil the co-operative work now carried on between the Churches:—a fiction dishonouring to all, implying that the Churches have not enough of the spirit of Christ to continue co-operation for good.

22. There is the fiction that "If Union comes all will fall in with it" a fiction insulting to the men and women who protest, implying that they have no convictions and will tamely submit to be herded into a creedless Church, by some whom they have employed and pledged to "maintain and defend" their present Church and who are not fulfilling their trust.

23. There is the fiction that "If Union comes you will never know the difference," when most congregations would at once know a difference in revenue, and some ministers a difference in salary:—When all would know a difference in "Calling" a minister for the whole matter would be in the hands of the "Settlement Committee," an irresponsible, autocratic body at a distance, meeting once a year, whose power over ministers and congregations would be absolute:—when the Supreme Court of the Church, the General Council, would be chiefly "prominents," while many of the rank and file of ministers and elders would never be members of it; when no minister would be pledged to any system of Truth and the door would be wide open to almost any error that new comers might choose to teach.

24. There is the fiction that the Church is pledged to Union and "must go forward or break faith;"—when the only pledge binding upon the Church is the agreement not to go forward under present conditions. At the Assembly of 1905 all parties entered into unanimous agreement that "Union"—"must carry the consent of the entire membership";—Seven years later that pledge was renewed by unanimous agreement as to the necessity for "practically unanimous action":—To attempt to force the merging of the churches now, on a vote of one third of the membership, and in face of large and growing opposition, is a direct violation of these agreements. The Church is bound by no other pledge, for no party has any power or right to pledge the Church to "'Union."

CHAPTER III.

The Doctrine in the Basis of Union

The Text of the Doctrinal Basis is Printed in Appendix V.

A.

SOURCES OF ITS TWENTY ARTICLES.

THE Purpose of the First Conference was not to draw up a final creed but to see how far the committees of the negotiating churches could agree. The idea of a creed came only as a result of years of working together.

At this first meeting together of the three denominational committees the Rev. Dr. Potts, of the Methodist Church, rose up to state that "there never could be any reconciliation between Calvinism and Arminianism." After a lengthy speech he was replied to by Rev. Dr. DuVal who said:

"Mr. Chairman (Dr. Warden) and brethren, thank God we do not have to reconcile Calvin and Arminius. Read the Apostle Paul in I Cor. 3: 3-13, as he said 'Who is Paul, and who is Apollos but ministers by whom ye believe.' So I say who is Calvin and who is Arminius but servants by whom some believe. It is our business as in the 11th verse to get back to the foundation which is Jesus Christ. It seems to me, Sir, that Dr. Potts and many others think that Calvin was a Presbyterian and Arminius a Methodist. Why, they were both Presbyterians. Arminius took his whole theology in the school of Calvin, and when the Remonstrants of Holland arose, the Hyper-calvinists chose Arminius to defend their position, as he was looked upon as the ablest scholar of their school; but he, after a long struggle with the question, concluded that he could not reconcile their views with a sound Christian philosophy. That old struggle reaching beyond the mind of men through "Pre" and "Inter" Sublapsarianism, (better known as Supra and Infralapsarianism), was rightly judged by the supreme court of Holland to "have no bearing on the main points pertaining to Salvation." "We were then," said Dr. DuVal, "not to fight over the metaphysical theories of men, but to go back to the plainer teaching of Christ. And if we were to have a theological battle, the Methodist brethren could sit aside until we Presbyterians settled the contest among our own theologians as both Calvin and Arminius were Presbyterians."

Dr. DuVal was congratulated by nearly all the members of the committee, who felt that his speech was the right one at the psychological moment. "After that," says Dr. DuVal "we had no more theological battles. Our meetings were gracious, the Presbyterians were the more pronounced on theological quibbles and the Methodists were more gentle, the Congregationalists were only concerned about citizen rights in polity—all of this goes to prove that the so-called "things the denominations respectively hold dear, "were not so much matters of conscience as the constraints of the events in which they had been generated—the Presbyterian in doctrinal conflict; the Methodist in spiritual revival; the Congregational out of a fear that Calvin's idea of the union of church and state would rob them of liberty."

This first conference on Doctrine appointed four sections, viz., Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal and Halifax, to meet before the next Assembly.

The Committee agreed to take up the "Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith" published by the Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in U. S. A., and make it the Basis of their Deliverance.*

Some little changes were made in its words. Their sixth and seventh articles were merged into one—but our present union basis had for its "norm" a Presbyterian digest, maintaining the full sovereignty of God, yet avoiding the extreme "fatalism" of the old Confession. "By looking over the old as compared with our union basis you will detect the mollifying influence of a truer Christian spirituality which our Lord is aiming at in John 17: 23, 'that the world might know that the Father had sent Him.' "

The "norm" of the basis came about in this manner. When the four sections met:—

Halifax and Winnipeg had no results but reported simply that they had discovered "No insuperable obstacle" in the way of the organic union of the three churches.

---

*This document is printed in Appendix I.

The Toronto section at the proposal of Rev. Dr. R. P. McKay was willing to sign the "Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith (U.S.A.)", with slight modifications.

The Montreal Section, with Dr. Scrimger as leader, presented a brief document containing XV Articles of Faith, unanimously adopted at Montreal, November 1905, as being in their judgment a doctrinal statement likely to prove acceptable to all the negotiating churches, and a copy was sent to each member of the Joint Committee, in the hope that it might form the basis for further discussion. No recommendation was made as to any terms of subscription, as that matter had been referred to another committee.*

A careful study of the Montreal document shows that Dr. Scrimger, the leader of the group appointed to go over suggested details of doctrine, had used a shortened creed of the English Presbyterian Church. He also used a commentary on this by Rev. Dr. Donald Fraser of London, England, (1892). He modified Calvinistic phrases, and brought it in printed form to the joint meeting of the four sections. His use of the English Articles was not generally known by the Committee.†

Headings of the Articles:

The Joint Committee drew up titles of Articles upon which they could agree, and looked to the Brief Reformed Creed (U.S.A.), and Dr. Scrimger's Montreal recommendations with its English background, for corresponding headings and fitting phrases. Preference was shown for the language of the American Creed rather than Dr. Scrimger's. The aim was to get a sufficient number of doctrinal points upon which to unite, so as to be able to report through the General Committee on Union to the governing bodies of the respective churches that "no insuperable barrier" had been found to the organic union of the three negotiating churches.

---

*For Doctrinal Basis of Union, proposed by the Montreal Local Committee, see Appendix III.

†For the English Presbyterian Articles see Appendix II; and for quotations from Dr. Donald Fraser's Commentary on same, see Addendum I, at close of book.

An Interim Report of the Sub-Committee on Doctrine based on the Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith (U.S.A.), and the Doctrinal Basis of Union, proposed by the Montreal Local Committee, therefore, became the norm for future deliberations.*

By a study of these two Presbyterian documents to which the Methodists did not object as a norm for discussions, and by a comparison of them with the various forms of the Basis of Union as published from time to time, by the respective churches, observing the modifications of the same, and checking them by the minutes of the sub- and joint committees on the Basis of Union, you may clearly trace the process that gradually resulted in the Doctrinal Basis for the proposed United Church.

The following observations are worthy of notice:

(1) As the Committee at first had no intention of drawing up a final creed but simply were anxious to see how far they could agree, the Methodists had no objection to the two Presbyterian documents as the norm of discussion. These documents were jostled about somewhat as to the numbering of the Articles, changes of phraseology, omissions and additions of clauses. The principal modifications are indicated under *Detailed Sources* (below).

(2) The substance of the final doctrinal basis was not distinctly Calvinistic or Arminian but both in an uncontroversial form.

(3) The Methodists had nothing in hand. The Presbyterians did not bring along their Westminster Standards, for fear, as one member of the Committee told me, the Methodists and Congregationalists might object to such pure and unadulterated standards. Even the creeds of Christendom were not in evidence at the meetings, though they may have been consulted at home by individual members of the Committee.

(4) Behind the two documents as 'norms' lies a long process of thought which greatly facilitated the work of our Canadian framers of the basis of doctrine.

---

*The Interim Report of the Sub-Committee on Doctrine, based on Appendices I and III is printed in Appendix IV.

(5) N.B. There was never a denominational division on any Article.

(6) The Winnipeg and Halifax sections made their contributions only in general terms. Rev. Dr. DuVal of Winnipeg was particularly helpful and aggressive in the suggestion of preferences.

(7) *Detailed Sources*:

(*a*) The first eleven Articles are almost entirely from the Brief American Statement of the Reformed Faith, with certain modifications; as is also Article XIV.

(*b*) Articles XV and XVI, 'Of the Church' and 'Of the Sacraments', show the work of Dr. Scrimger, with possibly the English background.

(*c*) Article XII on Sanctification was drawn up without reference to either of the two 'norms'. The first part was largely by Dr. Scrimger but the second part "We believe, etc.", though not in its exact final form, was suggested by Chancellor Burwash, of Victoria Methodist College, Toronto.

It is interesting to learn that Dr. Burwash was brought up in a Presbyterian atmosphere, yet was Arminian by conviction. This circumstance no doubt enabled him to make very valuable suggestions and contributions of a conciliatory nature.

Rev. Dr. Ramsay wisely opposed the attachment of 'Sanctification' to one verse of Scripture: "If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us." (I John 4: 12).

(*d*) Article II, 'Of Revelation', in the Brief U. S. Statement was considered too brief and not quite satisfactory as a statement in regard to inspiration. Hence the longer and "improved" form in the Basis of Union, Article II.

(*e*) Articles VI and VII of the Brief American Creed are merged in Article VI of the Basis of Union. The U. S. phrase "innumerable multitude chosen in Christ" was adopted in place of "the unchangeable number of the elect."

Besides the article title 'Of Election' in the U. S. Statement was dropped to avoid controversy and superfluity.

(*f*) Articles IX and XI of the U. S. Creed were reversed in their order in the Union Basis, and thus Article IX of the

Basis of Union 'Of Regeneration' precedes Article X, 'Of Faith and Repentance'. This was the right change to make, because logically the action of God precedes the act of faith on man's part.

(*g*) Article XI 'On Justification and Sonship'. The first half of this is taken from Article IX part I, of the U. S. Statement 'Of Faith and Repentance.' The second part is from the Montreal document Article VIII part 2, based on the English Creed.

In the first part of the Union Article the influence of both the Presbyterian and Methodist catechisms is seen.

(*h*) Article XIII, 'On Prayer', was not in the first edition of the Basis. It was inserted later to meet the objection of "Anti-Unionists", who complained of the omission of an Article on Prayer. This Article on Prayer is largely modelled after the Lord's Prayer.

(*i*) Article XIV, 'Of the Law of God', was inserted because of the insistence of the Methodists, for an Article in the interests of Christian Ethics.

(*j*) Article XV, 'On Baptism', caused the only grave division. The Methodists were prepared to baptize any child irrespective of inquiry as to parents' character or church membership. Their idea was to baptize for the sake of the child and to claim the infant for the Church. The Presbyterians vigorously opposed this. Superintendent Carman of the Methodist Church entered when the discussion was warmest and said, "We Methodists cannot be so loose," then he suggested the middle clause substantially as it stands in the present Basis, viz., "The proper subjects of Baptism are believers, and infants presented by their parents or guardians in the Christian Faith."

(*k*) Article I, 'On God'. In the first draft of the Basis, and in reference to the Trinity, the word "Persons" was used. The suggestion was made by Dr. (now Sir Robert) Falconer that "Persons" be dropped and some more appropriate term be used, which would not convey the idea of three distinct persons, and thus avoid the danger of representing the Godhead as three Gods. The answer was made that the Committee were not drawing up a creed but simply trying to agree upon essentials. But later on, when the Committee realized that they were actually preparing a "creed", the question was not taken up.

(*l*) Defects are naturally to be found as a result of the eclectic and mollifying methods used. Due consideration will be given to these as well as to the merits of the articles as the discussion proceeds.

(*m*) Likewise the Polity of the Basis will be dealt with, in a section by itself, (See Chapter V).

(*n*) It is interesting to learn from members of the Committee, by correspondence and personal interviews, that some of them thought the final form of their labours were very good for practical purposes, while others avowedly were not satisfied but acquiesced to help on organic union. Trouble from the Congregationists was forestalled by the omission of a categorical subscription to the doctrinal basis.

(*o*) Some of the members of the Committee admit the doctrinal basis to be a compromise, and do so unhesitatingly; while certain Presbyterians claim that they never yielded a point for purposes of compromise, but had to be convinced that it was the right thing to yield before they would grant a single concession. One prominent member of the committee informed me that in no wise was the Basis an unworthy compromise, and illustrated his assertion by declaring that it took the Congregationalists, on the Committee, a whole year to convince the Presbyterians that it was right and necessary to drop the Subscription to the Creed, on the part of candidates for the ministry. He further emphatically claimed that despite this omission, the demand is substantially the same as Subscription, because the candidate has in any case to satisfy the examiners as to his faith and conduct. He also stated that when omissions were made it was only after the Committee was convinced that the things dropped were superfluous.*

(*p*) Complaint has been made of the omission of various Articles of the Westminster Confession. It may be of use to record a brief statement of this type of protest, written by a very able and doughty champion of the Westminster Confession. He, of course, represents, I judge, but a small minority, who hold literally to the old-fashioned Presbyterian standards in *all* the articles he cites. He declares:

---

*See Chapter III. C. where the claim of subscription to the doctrinal basis is strenuously denied by non-unionists.

"To good Presbyterians, the fault of the Basis of Union does not lie so much in what it embraces as in what it excludes. There is *no mention made* in it of the substance *of eight of the Articles of the "Confession of Faith."* Not only are the matters of chapters III and VII, that is 'Of God's Eternal Decree' and 'Of God's Covenant with Man', omitted, but also chapter IX, 'Of Free Will'; chapter XVII, 'Of the Perseverance of the Saints'; chapter XXI, 'Of Religious Worship and the Sabbath Day'; chapter XXII, 'Of Lawful Oaths'; chapter XXIII, 'Of the Civil Magistrate'; chapter XXIV, 'Of Marriage and Divorce' which, with the Sabbath, receives only passing mention; while the subject of chapter X, 'Of Effectual Calling', is only briefly alluded to under Article VIII of the "Basis". "How the Presbyterian members of the Joint Committee," he concludes, "could have agreed that these important matters should not have a recognized place in the teaching of the new Christian Church, which they were about to start, passes comprehension, seeing how large a place some of these topics had in the past history of the churches of Scotland. Nor are they questions of little importance in Canada. On the contrary, some of them are live issues here."

The doughty critic and "anti-unionist" deserves all the more credit however, for having brought these omissions to light, together with many other criticisms, when he himself quite evidently did not know that our Westminster Confession and Standards were not used as the "norm" of discussion in the making of the present Basis of Union, but the "norms" to which I have referred at the opening of this section.

The Doctrine in the Basis of Union

B.

CHANGES IN DOCTRINAL BASIS (1906-1922).

From a study of the six reports of the sub-committee on Doctrine, the following changes have been gleaned.

1*st Report, Feb.* 1906.

1. There was no Preamble.

2. There were nineteen Articles on Doctrine. In the fifth report published in 1915, an Article on Prayer was inserted, making the number of the Articles 20.

The Preamble:

The Preamble was introduced into the Basis in the second report, (Feb. 1907). In the third report (Sept. 1907) the words "in 1886, and in the Standards of Doctrine and Articles of Religion accepted" were dropped.

The fourth report (Dec. 1908) added "do hereby set forth the substance of the Christian faith, as commonly held among us. In doing so, "We build" (instead of building). Added "laid by" after foundation.

Added: "We" before affirm.

Inverted order and changed, "and commend them to the studious attention of the United Church, and present....the ....report....as a brief summary of this faith"—to read— "We present....statement....adherents (added)....of the negotiating churches."

Added, "as in substance agreeable to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures."

In the fifth report the words, "confession that Jesus Christ is the chief corner-stone" are replaced by "Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone."

These changes having been made, furnish us with the 1922 Preamble, which is identical with that of 1915.

Article I. *On God.*

The second report omits "And the Father of our Spirits," and "and" before plenteous.

The third report omits, "who is" before ("a Spirit") and "of love and" after "full of".

Changed "three persons in one Godhead, one in substance,"....to read...."in the unity of the Godhead, three persons of the same substance; equal in power and glory."

In the fourth report, instead of, "We worship Him, Father, Son and Holy Spirit in the unity of the Godhead, three persons....", we read, "We worship Him in the unity of the Godhead, and the mystery of the Holy Trinity (added), the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit."

The fifth report is identical with the sixth (final) report, as to its Article,—"Of God."

Article II. *Of Revelation*:

The second report adds, "that He has fully and perfectly revealed Himself in" (Jesus Christ).—Adds "who" (before is the brightness)—Drops "gratefully" (before "receive") and transposes phrases to make better English.

The third report shows a verbal transposition almost back to the first report, but drops "gratefully" as in second report, and changes "receiving the Holy Scriptures to be....the Word of God,"....to read.... "as containing the only infallible rule of faith and life...."

Reads "God has revealed Himself in nature" &c., instead of "God is revealed in part in nature, &c".

Adds "been graciously pleased to make" before "clearer revelation."

Changed "spake" to "spoke".

Adds "And......in the fullness of time" instead of "has fully" ("revealed Himself").

In the fifth report, "Of the Old Testament and of the New Testament," is amended to read, "of the Old and New Testaments."

The sixth report (1922) makes no change from that of 1915.*

---

*As a matter of fact the 1915 Report is the final one, voted upon by the Church, and now intended to be an integral part of the proposed enabling legislation. There are therefore really only 5 Reports, but I call the latest publication (1922) a 6th Report, to show no changes since 1915.

Article III. *"Of the Divine Purpose"*—is the same in all six reports.

Article IV. *"Of Creation and Providence"*—drops "forever" before "responsible" in second report. Otherwise the article is identical in all reports.

Article V. *"Of the Sin of Man"*—drops in the second report, "we confess" before "that, by reason of disobedience," and in the fourth report drops "we and" before "all men are born with a sinful nature."

Article VI. *"Of the Grace of God"*—is identical in the six reports, with the exception that in the second report, the words "from the beginning" before "in His good pleasure" are dropped.

Article VII. *"Of the Lord Jesus Christ"*—is the same in all except the second report.

"Yet" is added before "without sin."

"For us" is changed to "for our redemption."

"Divine" is substituted for "eternal" justice.

"to take away the sin of the world" becomes "and made propitiation for the sins of the world."

"for us" is dropped before "He rose".

"In our hearts, joined to Him by faith" is changed to read, "In the hearts of believers." The punctuation and the wording are also improved.

Article VIII. *"Of the Holy Spirit"*.

The second report drops "everywhere" before "upon the hearts of men," and adds, "and of love".

The third report adds "of power."

In the 4th, 5th and 6th reports the Article is identical.

N.B.—In the second report Article XI becomes Article IX; and Articles IX and X becomes Articles X and XI respectively. This enumeration is continued. Hence I adopt here the new order of numbering, which is that of the final (1922) report, and thus simplify the comparative study of changes. (See *"Sources"* above for explanation of this change in the order of Articles).

Article IX. *"Of Regeneration"*.

The only change in this Article is the slight verbal one in second report where "by a secret and wonderful" is replaced by "by the gracious and mysterious" (operation).

Article X. *"Of Faith and Repentance"*—is the same throughout. Except that in the 1922 report "reluctance" for "repentance" is a printer's error.

Article XI. *"Of Justification and Sonship"*—

In third report, the English is toned up a bit, and there are two additions, (1) "as their Saviour and Lord," (2) accepts them as righteous and bestows upon them "the adoption, &c".

Article XII. *"Sanctification"*.

The second report changes "grow in sanctified character" to "grow in the likeness of Christ," and "with Christ" is "with Him". It transposes "assurances of faith and to that maturity of faith" to read "that maturity and full assurance of faith."

"Working by love which the Scriptures call the love of God made perfect in us" becomes "whereby the love of God is made perfect in us."

In the sixth report "the" instead of "and" before "obedience" is a printer's error.

Article XIII. Becomes Article XIV, by the insertion of an Article on Prayer (Art. XIII) in the 1915 report, which remains unchanged in the final report (1922).

N.B. I adopt the new numbering resulting from the insertion of this Art. XIII on Prayer, so that the numbering of the Articles will correspond with that of the final form of the "Basis".

Article XIV. *"Of the Law of God."*

The only changes are in the third report, viz: (1) "moral" is added before "law"; (2) "summarized" is used in place of "revealed," (3) "disclosed in the words of Christ, is forever established in truth and equity, so that no human work shall abide except if it be built on this foundation"—is changed to read—"testified to by the prophets and unfolded in the life and teachings of Jesus Christ, stands forever in truth and equity, and is not made void by faith, but on the contrary is established thereby."

Article XV. *"Of the Church."*

The second report changes the semi-colon to a period before "further", and adds "together" before "with". The third report adds "and other baptized children."

Article XVI. *"Of the Sacraments".*

"the two sacraments" is added in the second report, as is also "by which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and comfort our faith in Him, and also."

(1) The second report further changes "Baptism with water into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost is the sacrament which implies our relation to the covenant of grace and our consecration to the Christian life, and typifies our union to Christ and regeneration of the Spirit and the washing away of our sins," to read "Baptism with water into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit is the sacrament instituted by our Lord to signify and seal our union to Himself and our participation in the blessings of the new covenant."

"Or guardians" is added.

"Should promise to train up," becomes "should train up".

The addition is made, "and should expect that their children will receive, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, the benefits which the Sacrament is designed and fitted to convey."

(2) Drops the last clause, "and are free from scandal and open sin."

The third report adds "only" (the two sacraments), and also adds "which were" (instituted).

The fifth report drops "only" before "two sacraments."

It drops "and" before "as a means of grace."

It changes "by which He doth work invisibly in us" to read "by which, working in us, He doth."

It adds "and as ordinances" before "through the observance of which."

Under (1) it changes "instituted by our Lord to signify and seal our union to Himself and our participation in the blessings of the new covenant," to read "by which are signified and sealed our union to Christ and participation in the blessings of the new covenant."

Article XVII. *"Of the Ministry"*—No change is made.

Article XVIII. *"Of Church Order and Fellowship".*

"Persons" is substituted for "officers" in the second report.

The fifth report changes "We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ is the sole Head of the Church" to read "We believe that the Supreme and only Head of the Church is the Lord Jesus Christ."

Article XIX. *"Of the Resurrection, the Last Judgment and the Future Life."*

In the second report "the living" is substituted for "the quick" (and the dead).

The third report changes "that the finally impenitent shall suffer eternal death, and the righteous shall abide in blessedness forever with God" to read "that the finally impenitent shall go away into eternal punishment and the righteous into life eternal."

Article XX. *"Of Christian Service and the Final Triumph".*

The only change in this Article is found in the third report where the words "servants and friends (of Christ)" become "disciples and servants (of Christ)". There is also added: "to further the extension of His Kingdom."

A Summary of the Above Changes.

1. *Additions*:

(1) A Preamble—which is more or less a serious attempt at comprehensiveness. The idea of taking it seriously is somewhat, if not practically, excluded by the articles on doctrine that follow the Preamble, which cannot logically be fused or reconciled.

(2) A succinct and suggestive Article on Prayer, which is based on the Lord's Prayer. (See Article XIII).

2. Changes:
Article I.—3 changes, 2 of which are purely verbal.
“ II.—8 changes—principally verbal.
“ III.—no change.
“ IV.—one word dropped.
“ V.—two verbal changes.
“ VI.—one verbal change.
“ VII.—5 changes—almost wholly verbal.
“ VIII.—2 descriptive words added of value, and one valueless adverb dropped.
“ IX.—one more choice expression used.
“ X.—no change.
“ XI.—2 changes of some theological significance.
“ XII.—A modern expression preferred to an archaic one. One relaxation of a scriptural tie.
“ XIII.—Added in 1915 on Prayer.
“ XIV.—A word of modern tinge added. A sentence improved in English, with a clarifying touch as to the meaning of the Article.
“ XV.—A punctuation mark changed. A word added to improve the English. A phrase added to enlarge the scope of candidacy for baptism.
“ XVI.—Received most attention. Its first form is improved in content and in English, but it is still somewhat meagre, from the purest Presbyterian standpoint.
“ XVII.—No change.
“ XVIII.—A word is changed democratically. A phrase is improved in honour of Christ.
“ XIX.—A modern word is substituted for an ambiguous scriptural word. A sentence is changed with a view to improving the Article, but it is debatable if the remedy is not worse than the disease.
“ XX.—A word is substituted which is little better, if as good as the one displaced.

Implications:

This doctrinal basis has been before the Church for 16 or 17 years and the above, broadly speaking, is the result of the deliberations of those appointed to draw up the Articles of Doctrine. May we not at least conclude from the meagre changes made in the original draft, in all those years, in the actual substance of doctrine, that:

(1) The Committee or Committees did not overwork themselves. This conclusion is strengthened by Chapter III, A, which shows the compilers depended on two ready-to-hand documents as "norms".

(2) That they either considered the drawing up of a "Creed" or "affirmation of common faith" a very simple or an extremely difficult task.

(3) That the old school of theology very largely predominated.

(4) That the "Basis" was not changed to meet the progress in modern and social theology, that was forging ahead during all those years.

(5) That very inadequate attention and respect was given to the up-to-date professors and ministers, who claim to have sent in suggestions which were turned down by the Committee, on the score that the purpose of the Committee was not the drawing up of a creed but the finding of points of agreement, and the setting aside of contentious differences.

(6) That the Basis should still be thoroughly revised, or a new one drawn up to meet modern thought and needs.

(7) That there is a certain amount of hopeful emancipation from objectionable dogma even in this "Basis", despite its deficiency.

C.

NO CREDAL SUBSCRIPTION IN THE BASIS.

In the section on the ministry in the basis of union, the matter of greatest interest and the source of spirited debate is the relations of a minister to the doctrines of the church.* The divergence of opinion concerning this section appears to be on three main points; (1) Whether or not there is any credal subscription at all in the basis; (2) The advisability of having or not having any subscription; (3) The adequacy or inadequacy of the questions to be answered by candidates for the ministry at their ordination.

Before entering upon a discussion of this vexed question, and in order to bring the whole matter more clearly before the reader's mind, I now give a documentary display of the questions asked at ordination of Methodists and Presbyterians, followed by the ordination questions in the proposed basis.

(1) *Methodist Questions Asked at Ordination of Ministers*:†

1. Do you think, in your heart, that you are truly called, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, to the office of a minister?

2. Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrines required of necessity for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ? And are you determined out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scriptures?

3. Will you then give your faithful diligence always to minister the doctrines, and sacraments, and discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded?

4. Will you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word; and to use both public and private monitions and exhortations, as well as to the sick as to the whole within your charge, as need shall require and occasion shall be given?

5. Will you be diligent in prayers, and in reading of the

---

*Appendix V, The Ministry, III, 1, 2, 3, (1) (2) (3).

†*Meth. Book of Discipline,* paragraph 522; p. 367 ff. (See also par. 120, p. 65, Ibid, re examination of candidates).

Holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same, laying aside the study of the world and the flesh?

6. Will you be diligent to frame and fashion yourselves and your families, according to the doctrines of Christ; and to make both yourselves and them, as much as in you lieth, wholesome examples and patterns to the flock of Christ?

7. Will you maintain and set forward as much as lieth in you, quietness, peace, and love among all Christian people, and especially among them that are or shall be committed to your charge?

8. Will you reverently obey your chief ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over you; following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, submitting yourselves to their godly judgment?

(2) *Questions to be Put to Presbyterian Ministers in Canada at Ordination.**

1. Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and manners?

2. Do you believe the Westminister Confession of Faith, as adopted by this Church in the Basis of Union (1875 Union),† to be founded on and agreeable to the Word of God, and in your teaching do you promise faithfully to adhere thereto?

3. Do you believe the government of this Church by Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies, to be founded on and agreeable to the Word of God, and do you engage as a Minister of this Church to maintain and defend the same?

4. Do you own the purity of worship at present authorized by this Church, and do you undertake to conform thereto?

5. Do you promise to give a dutiful attendance in the Courts of this Church, to submit yourself in the spirit of meekness to the admonitions of this Presbytery, to be subject to it and the superior courts, to follow no divisive course, but maintain according to your power the unity and peace of the Church?

6. Are zeal for the glory of God, love to the Lord Jesus Christ, and desire of saving souls, so far as you know your own heart, your great motives and chief inducements to enter (or continue in) the office of the ministry?

7. Have you directly or indirectly used any undue means to procure this call?

8. Do you engage, in the strength and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, to live a holy and circumspect life, to rule well your own house, and faithfully and diligently to discharge all the duties of the ministry to the edification of the body of Christ?

**Rules and Forms of Procedure,* Pres. Ch. in Canada (1919 ed.) par. 33, pp. 79-80.

†Parenthesis mine.

(Elders of the present Presbyterian Church in Canada, at their ordination service, subscribe to the Westminster Confession of Faith, to the Presbyterian form of government, and to the purity of worship at present authorized by this church, etc.* For admission to full communion as members of the Presbyterian Church, the second question asked is, "Do you believe that the doctrines of this church, as set forth in the Shorter Catechism,† are in accordance with the Word of God.‡ In the Methodist Church the standards of doctrine are binding only on ministers. Members are not bound by them, although there is a form of reception service in the Book of Discipline which asks certain doctrinal questions).§

(3) *Ordination Questions to be Put to Ministers, According to The Proposed Basis of Union.*

1. Do you believe yourself to be a child of God, through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ?

2. Do you believe yourself to be called of God to the office of the Christian ministry, and your chief motives to be zeal for the glory of God, love for the Lord Jesus Christ, and desire for the salvation of men?

3. Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrines required for eternal salvation in our Lord Jesus Christ, and are you resolved out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing which is not agreeable thereto?

(The reader will note by comparison of the ordination questions herein set forth, that Question 2 of the basis of union, is a combination of the first Methodist and sixth Presbyterian questions to be put at ordination of ministers. The third question of the basis of union is really the second Methodist question of ordination. It is also convenient to notice here that the list of Methodist ordination questions are much superior in comprehensiveness and depth of meaning than the three questions in the basis of union).

Broadly viewed we may classify the divergent opinions

Rules and Forms of Procedure, Pres. Ch. par. 34, p. 81.

†Discarded in Basis of Union.

‡*Rules and Forms of Procedure*, Pres. Ch. par. 40, p. 85.

§Reception into full membership, *Meth. Book of Discipline*, par. 517, p. 340.

expressed in the debate concerning the relations of a minister to the doctrines of the church, under five main heads:

I. ARGUMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED BASIS AS A COMPROMISE IN THE MATTER OF CREDAL SUBSCRIPTION.

One striking example is to be found in the words of Principal Fraser,* a distinguished scholar, and a prominent leader against organic union. He writes as follows:†

"In the Congregational Church no creed-subscription is required from the candidate for the ministry. Before his ordination he makes a statement of his belief to a council or association of local congregations, and the living faith of the church in the community is made the test of his doctrinal fitness for the office. In the Methodist Church the candidate is examined at an early stage of his student career, in the sermons and notes of John Wesley and the Twenty-five Articles which are selections from the Anglican Thirty-nine. His ordination vows are connected with experience and practice rather than doctrinal beliefs. In the Presbyterian Church there is required an apparently rigid subscription to the Westminster Confession as a subordinate standard, viz., 'Do you believe the Westminster Confession of Faith, as adopted by this Church in the Basis of Union, to be founded on and agreeable to the Word of God and in your teaching will you faithfully adhere thereto?' Various methods of casuistry are resorted to in order to mitigate the severity of this ordination test. The phrase 'As adopted by this church in the Basis of Union' sometimes affords relief, for it is commonly understood that there was a tacit understanding in 1875 between the Old Kirk Liberals and the Canada Presbyterian Conservatives that large liberty should be allowed in interpreting the Confession, and it was partly on this that the heresy charge against the late D. J. Macdonnell (Minister of St. Andrew's Church, Toronto) was brought.

"Again it is represented that only acceptance of the system of theology embodied in the Confession is required and that departure from any detailed statements is not forbidden. Moreover, the tolerant spirit of the Presbyterian Church is evident from the fact that the General Assembly has never disciplined a professor or minister in the interests of Orthodoxy. At the same time many a sensitive candidate for ordination finds himself in an embarrassing position. If he gives unqualified assent to the prescribed questions he doubts his loyalty to absolute intellectual integrity; and if he gives a qualified assent, he seems to cast reflections on the sincerity or enlightenment of his 'Fathers and brethren'. For many years there has been wide-spread dissatisfaction with a subscription that worries consciences, even that are not finical at the solemn moment of ordination, that involves the appearance at least of lowering ones moral standard for entrance to the ministry and that gives to many outsiders the impression either of obscurantism or insincerity.

---

*Of Pres. College, Montreal.

†*Harvard Theol. Review,* July, 1915.

"The compromise effected in the proposed Basis would seem to meet fairly well the needs of all the churches. 'Candidates shall be examined in the statement of doctrine of the United Church and shall before ordination satisfy the examining body that they are in essential agreement therewith, and that as ministers of the church they accept the statement as in substance agreeable to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures.' The questions at ordination which bear on this are:— 'Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrines required for eternal salvation in our Lord Jesus Christ? Are you resolved out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge and to teach nothing which is not agreeable thereto?

"The terms of this subscription would seem to allow standing room in the ministry of the United Church for men of different attitudes to questions of inspiration, infallibility and inerrancy of the Bible."

II. Arguments for the Basis as Containing Credal Subscription.

Rev. Dr. Gandier, (Principal of Knox College, Toronto) writes: "On the vexed question of the relation of a minister to the doctrines of his church, the General Assembly in 1914 approved and sent down to Presbyteries under the Barrier Act a proposal to permit the minister who presides at ordination to read a prescribed statement which accords the candidate 'liberty of opinion on such points in her subordinate standards as do not enter into the system of doctrine contained therein,' but which reserves to the church the right to determine what such points may be.

"A similar liberty and a similar safeguard are provided in the Basis of Union. The examining body are to be satisfied that the candidate's views are in essential agreement with the 'Doctrinal Statement' and furthermore he is required to accept the statement itself 'as in substance agreeable to the teachings of the Holy Scriptures.' His mere assent, however is not sufficient. The final judgment on his qualifications is reserved in the hands of the conference. No mere formal acceptance of the letter of a written creed is counted sufficient; the church itself through its living members is to decide whether each candidate is in essential agreement with the doctrines of the church. After all, that is the only protection possible against unworthy men or women out of harmony with the faith of the church."*

III. Arguments for the Basis as Containing no (Categorical) Credal Subscription.

(*a*) A Congregationalist leader and splendid preacher writes: "We Congregationalists found some consolation in having the concession made that men who were being ordained to the ministry were not required to give a categorical assent to the Creed."†

(*b*) A leading Hamilton preacher and unionist says: "The lack of subscription in the basis allows for varied interpretation. There is poetry as well as prose in the Scriptures 'containing the Word of God.' Uniformity belongs to a credal age, the age of the Book. Growing democracy is against it now. There is in the Basis a freedom despite the language of the Book and of bygone centuries."‡

(*c*) A learned Professor of Systematic Theology and an ardent unionist declares in regard to no credal subscription: "This is the glory of the new basis, because subscription merely puts a premium on hypocrisy. Besides the ordaining committee are best able to judge a candidate's qualifications. To take a vow to the Westminster Confession, as heretofore, is most preposterous since it is not a Confession of Faith at all but a Calvinistic System of Divinity."§

(*d*) A leading exponent of union in the Methodist Church said: "It is difficult to have any subscription. The Presbyterians wanted subscription in the basis of union. The Congregationalists fought against subscription, for one year, and won out. There must be no 'must' as to subscription.

---

*"Church Union—an Opportunity and a Duty, etc." (Murray Printing Co., Toronto). See Appendix XI, 6 (9).

†Letter to me.

‡Personal Interview.

§Personal Interview.

There is no place for coercion. It is infamous impropriety to deal with reasoning, thinking ministers or people as children. The pages of human history have been blackened by 'must'. The thumbscrew, the boot, the fires of Smithfield, are still fresh in our memory. The church has been the greatest sinner in the matter of intolerance. We must crush it now in the interest of scientific open-mindedness and of Christian charity."*

IV. ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE BASIS AS CONTAINING NO (DEFINITE) CREDAL SUBSCRIPTION.

(*a*) "We believe that we are being asked to cast in our lot with what will be a Church without doctrine; the creed handed down to us is to be wiped out; it is true that a new one is to be substituted for it, but it will be quite optional, and in no way binding even on Ministers. In the effort to make things sufficiently broad to enable anyone to join the new body, the obligations of a Minister in the matter of creed are limited to satisfying an examining body that he is in 'essential' agreement with the proposed creed and answering the following question: 'Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrines required for eternal salvation in our Lord Jesus Christ, and are you resolved out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing which is not agreeable thereto?' Such an obligation can be assumed by a Unitarian, a Christian Scientist, or a Mormon, each sincerely advocating his own interpretation, and every man may in spite of it preach what is right in his own eyes.

"Apparently there is an influential section of the Church which wishes to eliminate all embarrassment of doctrine, and to make of the Church a non-sectarian institution similar to the Canadian Club or the Rotarians; a worthy enough thing so far as it goes, but not essentially Christian, as we understand the term. Such idealists are naturally unionists, and while it is not suggested that all unionists are of this mind now, we fear that this will be the line increasingly taken in the proposed union. The Westminster Standards are human and may require amendment to make them consistent with modern thought, but we are not prepared to admit that they are relics of magic and witchcraft, to quote an extremist. We believe that a definite formulation of belief is a vital necessity for the ordinary Church member. There may be individuals of exceptional strength of mind and character who can suspend judgment on most of the points of belief mentioned in the Apostles' Creed and still find enough left in their religion, but are they aware of the debt they owe to their early beliefs? How much belief of any kind will exist in a generation born in a Church without fixed belief? And how much conviction will the pulpit carry, if its own convictions are doubted?"*

---

*Private Interview, and public sermon. My notes were taken during both these utterances.

(*b*) A prominent minister of Toronto:† "I strenuously object to the doctrine and polity of the Basis of Union." (He gave reasons).‡ "But why bother discussing the union creed since there is no subscription to it. To say that there is, is surely very misleading. As a matter of fact the candidate for the ministry is to be responsible to a committee of 'conference.' Such committees die in a day. Therefore the Basis of Union simply means that no statement of credal subscription is made to any court of the Church that can hold the candidate responsible." (He then severely criticized the questions of ordination as paltry and gave a logical analysis of them to prove his point).

(*c*) A well-known Presbyterian minister of Toronto:§ "It is preposterous to attempt to establish a great church, much less a Merger of churches without a credal pledge from ministers and elders. It is a fatal weakness. It provides no safeguard against error or false doctrine. You could not join an Orange Lodge or any other Society without pledging yourself to keep its laws and principles. A teacher of Russelism could answer the questions asked in the Basis of Union and go on preaching his own doctrine. Even the question for admission to full (Presbyterian) communion is abandoned, e.g. 'Do you believe that the doctrines of this Church, as set forth in the Shorter Catechism, are in accordance with the word of God.' "¶

(*d*) An able Presbyterian minister spoke these words to me in a private interview: "I am a Unionist, if by Union you mean the church is an organism and not an organization. As to Credal Subscription, I am confident that for many a man subscription to the Westminster Confession is a palpable lie. The Westminster Confession must be modified, revived or dropped. The Creed of the Proposed United Church should be of such a quality as to commend itself to intelligent Christian men. The new creed should be broad and binding. We ought to have subscription in the new basis. A minister is not meant to be a silent acquiescer. He ought to be a propagandist for Christ, and boldy announce his beliefs in the big essentials of the Christian Faith."

---

*Geo. F. Macdonnell, K. C., Ottawa, St. Andrew's Ch. Message. Mr. Macdonnell is a son of the late distinguished minister of St. Andrew's Church Toronto.

†Deceased 1922. His words were dictated to me in personal interview.

‡Parenthesis mine.

§Personal interview.

¶Compare Appendix V, II, B. 11 (*a*) re Membership with *Rules and Forms of Procedure*, Pres. Ch. in Canada (1919), Appendices 40, p. 85; also compare Section on Ministry set forth at beginning of this chapter, with Appendices 33 (1) and 34 pp. 79-81, Ibid.

(*e*) An eminent opponent of the Organic Union proposed in Canada, has tersely stated his views on the lack of credal subscription to the basis in these words:

"One all-sufficient reason for not accepting this Statement of Doctrine, apart altogether from its merits or demerits, is the fact that it is not what it appears to be. It is not the Creed or Doctrinal Basis of the proposed new church, for the simple reason that no one is asked to pledge himself to it as a statement of his belief, or to promise to conform to it in his teaching.

"A creed does not in any sense take the place of Scripture, but is a statement of what a church believes to be taught in the Scriptures and of what that church agrees to teach as the truth of Scripture.

"Our own Presbyterian Church sets forth in its Standards, the Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, what the Scriptures teach concerning the great truths of Christianity; and every minister at ordination publicly accepts the Statements of these Standards as 'founded on and agreeable to the Word of God' and freely and voluntarily pledges that in his 'teaching' he 'will adhere thereto.'

"In the Basis of Union there is no such declared acceptance of its Doctrinal Statement, no promise to teach in accordance therewith.

"In the earlier drafts of the Basis of Union there was such a question proposed for ministers at ordination, as follows:

"Do you believe the Statement of Doctrine of the United Church, as you understand it, to be agreeable to the teachings of the Holy Scriptures, and is your confession of faith in agreement therewith, and as a minister of the church, do you pledge adhesion thereto?'

"But the Congregationalists objected to this because their ministers do not subscribe to any creed, and on their account the question was omitted.

"Their total membership when the vote was taken was about one-sixtieth, or less than two per cent. of the membership of the other two negotiating churches, and yet, that they might be included, that important safeguard of Scripture truth and teaching was taken away. The proposed union is practically literally without a Doctrinal Basis of any kind, and the door stands wide open to error taught in the name of the Church."*

---

*Pres. Ch. Assoc. Lit.

V. Arguments Against the Basis as Containing Inadequate and Superficial Questions on Credal Subscription.*

The following criticisms of the union ordination questions are worthy of consideration:

(*a*) Dr. Scott, Editor of the Presbyterian Record, and a brilliant antagonist of organic union writes in a pamphlet entitled "Letters to an Enquirer" (Montreal 1917), these words:

"One serious objection 'to the merger' is its attitude towards the great truths of the Christian Faith.

"In the Basis of Union as printed in 1906, there were three vows, to be taken by the ministers at ordination.

(1) Do you believe yourself to be now a child of God, through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ? Do you believe yourself to be truly called to the office of the Christian Ministry, and that your motives are zeal for the glory of God, love to the Lord Jesus Christ, and desire for the salvation of men?

(2) Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrines required for eternal salvation in our Lord Jesus Christ? And are you resolved out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge and to teach nothing which is not agreeable thereto?

(3) Do you believe the Statement of Doctrine of the United Church as you understand it, to be agreeable to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, and is your own personal faith in essential agreement therewith?

"In the Basis of Union, as it appeared two years later the three vows are those we now have in the Basis of Union." (I have just quoted these above, as well as at the beginning of this section Chapter III, C)".†

Dr. Scott continues: "What change was made? And why? At the demand of a few, the third question, in which the minister declared his acceptance of the Basis of Union, was quietly dropped so that ministers in the new church need not be pledged to any System of Truth, not even to the Basis of Union itself; and to make up the previous number of questions, the first was just quietly split in two.

---

*These questions are found at beginning of this section, and are taken from Appendix V, The Ministry, III, 3 (1) (2) (3); see also 1, and 2 re examination of students.

†Parenthesis mine.

But does not the minister promise to teach the Bible? Is that not Sufficient?

It is not sufficient. You want to know what the minister whom you call to your pulpit will teach from the Bible. Unitarians, Christian Scientists, Seventh Day Adventists, even Mormons, claim to teach the Bible. But some of them teach from it ruinous error and not saving truth.

What the world needs and wants is a message not less clear and definite but more so. And that definite message a church must bear if she would give a saving Gospel to the world.

A peril of the Church to-day is Unitarianism, which takes from Christ His crown of deity. For such a peril the Basis of Union leaves an open door.

To exchange the Presbyterian Church, with her Creed for which she stands, for a less definite testimony for which nobody is asked to stand, would be a long step downward and backward."

Rev. Dr. Scott then proceeds to illustrate from history what he terms "The Blight of a Creedless Church." He says:

"A. H. Drysdale in his history, which is published by authority of the church, and therefore accepted as accurate, tells that after the Act of Toleration in 1689 (Page 302) there were 500 Presbyterian congregations in England, and they were by far the most influential Non-Conformist body in the Kingdom.

"Creed subscription was not required, but the growing laxity in doctrine brought the matter before the Salter's Hall Synod in February, 1710, when subscription was left an open question; and the Exeter Hall Assembly, in May 1711, failed to deal with it effectually. In 1770, 'Arianism' (denying the Deity of Jesus Christ) 'had become the fixed and avowed doctrinal position.'

"When the Synod of the Presbyterian Church in England was organized in 1842 (page 610) by Scotch immigrants aided by the Presbyterian churches of Scotland, it was composed of seventy congregations, only two-thirds of which were of the original stock.

"Come to the new world. The Congregationalism of New England, once Puritan, Orthodox and Evangelical, had no creed to which it subscribed and for which it stood. Not a little of that Church drifted into Unitarianism, which has many wealthy churches, but so far as I know they have not sent a missionary to the heathen world. And no wonder. They have no Gospel of

Redemption to preach, no Divine Redeemer of whom to tell.

"'Universalism,' 'Christian Science,' 'Esoteric Buddhism,' 'The New Thought,' and other kindred errors find in New England a fertile soil."

"And yet," Dr. Scott adds, "it is proposed to cast aside our Presbyterian Church organization, pledged to the great truths that centre in a Divine Redeemer, and to build Canada's religious future upon a creedless system, to which no one is pledged, and which has done so much to blight the religious life of England Old and New."*

(*b*) A very scholarly Professor of the Presbyterian Church expressed himself freely on the point of discussion under review. He said, in effect:†

(1) "It would not be quite accurate to say that there is no subscription, and yet it virtually amounts to that; whereas there ought to be some definite form of subscription.

(2) "We have a bad enough set of questions now for the Canadian Presbyterian Church. It is the only Presbyterian Church in the world with such inadequate questions, but it at least recognizes the Church as a Living Body. This is omitted in the Basis of Union. The Roman Catholic Priest is only asked 'Will you obey your Bishop Father-in-God?' That is the expression of a living authority and the living mind of the church concentrated in an organ. The mind of the church binds us as Presbyterians through the Presbytery whereas in the Roman Catholic Church through one man. The Presbyterian Church is a church, not a sect (like Methodism) and ought to ask allegiance to the church as authority in sincere charity. The Basis omits the essential of discipline and responsibility to a Corporate Body (the Church)."

(3) The three questions of Ordination in the Basis of Union were severely criticized by him, thus:

(*a*) Question 1,—"Do you believe yourself to be a child of God, through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ?" This is superficial. When a British subject vows allegiance to the King, it means that he is a British subject without proclaiming so. This question does not belong to any church of catholic spirit. The Roman position puts us to shame at this point. A Buddhist could profess to be a child of God.

Question 2,—"Do you believe yourself called of God, etc. The latter part is a paraphrase. Better words might have been

---

*Prof. Briggs also treats of this disastrous result of no subscription in his *Theological Symbolics*.

†The gist of an interview.

chosen for this question. The question really belongs to a certain stage in development towards Ordination but not at this point.

Question 3,—......are you resolved out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people *and to teach nothing which is not agreeable thereto?"* The italicised phrase is weak and renders the whole question inadequate, and opens wide the door to error. Mormons, Unitarians and all sorts of such people might subscribe to this question. Besides, it is wholly contrary to Presbyterianism to limit the scope of doctrine to Scripture. There are denominations and sects which do this and ignore Confessions of Faith, but not the Presbyterian Church.* The Anglican and Roman Catholic questions are on a much higher plane.

"These questions entirely go back on the Presbyterian loyalty to the church, its courts, and its doctrine. There is, therefore, virtually no vow to maintain and defend this 'creedless' United Church. We must have our official teachers of religion bound to the whole church. It is absolutely wrong for them to swerve from their allegiance. Moreover Presbyterian Standards are gone back on by no vow to own 'the purity of worship at present authorized by this (the Presbyterian) Church (in Canada).'† The Directory for the Public Worship of God "is part of our Canadian Presbyterian law.‡ This is entirely neglected in these ordination questions, and is, therefore, a contradiction of the Westminster position."§

I should like again to draw special attention to the fact mentioned in the above quotation (relative to Question 3), that Presbyterianism does not limit the scope of doctrine to Scripture. The Church of Scotland, of which the Presbyterian Church of Canada is the daughter, adopted in 1912 as one of its questions to be put at ordination, "Do you believe the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith contained in the Confession of Faith of this Church?"¶ This is a definite credal subscription, whereas the question in the Basis of Union is not, and is regarded by many as an evasion. And yet the Scottish subscription is required only in a broad spirit of charity. With this in mind I submit the words of two eminent Scottish theologians.

---

*The Professor's contention is supported by the ordination questions of the Church of Scotland. Cf. *Mair's Digest of Church Laws.*

†Bracketed words mine, cf. Question 4 of Presbyterian Ordination.

‡*See Rules and Procedure,* Pres. Church in Canada, p. 69.

§Likewise the Larger and Shorter Catechisms are discarded. See (Ibid).

¶*Mair's Digest of Church Laws,* p. 316.. For the long story lying behind this form of question see McCrie's History.

Dean W. P. Paterson, of the University of Edinburgh writes:

"If a church requires the acceptance of a detailed Confession, while yet protesting that the Supreme Judge by which all doctrinal questions are to be settled must be the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture, it seems to be necessary either that such a church should hold an investigation from time to time as to whether the Confession is based on an adequate interpretation of Scripture, or that individuals should be allowed a measure of liberty within the debatable ground of theology. The necessity of some measure of personal liberty was recognized even by the scholastics of the seventeenth century. Turretin distinguishes between the obligations which a confession imposes upon a minister in his public teaching, and those which it imposes upon him *in foro conscientiae.* In his public work he is under an obligation not to attack the doctrine of the Church. In the forum of conscience he is bound by it only so far as it is perceived to be in agreement with the Word of God. This seems to be a satisfactory working hypothesis, when the obvious addition is made that 'in the forum of conscience' the individual minister must be at least in substantial agreement with the doctrines set forth in the Confession of his church."*

Professor Curtis of Aberdeen University, writes:

"No rational being," says Robert Flint in his monumental work on Agnosticism, "can be creedless. The agnostic can no more dispense with a creed than his neighbours, although it may be peculiarly difficult or inconvenient for him to profess that he has one. The advocate of universal doubt cannot take a single step towards the vindication of his doubt unless he believes, and believes himself to know what certainty, knowledge, evidence, and truth are." "The very logic," as Edward Caird says, "by which the sceptic overthrows the dogmas of philosophy, implies that the mind possesses in itself the form and idea of truth. His deepest doubt reveals a certitude that transcends and embraces it." When Huxley declared that Science commits suicide the moment it accepts a creed, he could only mean that it was fatal to Science to accept a creed as the last word of truth, as unrevisable, else Science has been in a state of "perpetual suicide," for it has never been without its working Creed, with Nature's Laws and man's hypotheses for its dogmatic articles. Following Auguste Comte, John Stuart Mill states it as fundamental to the Positivist religion, that "there must be a creed or conviction claiming authority over the whole of human life; a belief, or set of beliefs, deliberately adopted, respecting human destiny and

---

*W. P. Paterson, *The Rule of Faith.*

duty, to which the believer inwardly acknowledges that all his actions ought to be subordinate." And Herbert Spencer's Autobiography closes with the striking confession: "Religious creeds, which in one way or other occupy the sphere that rational interpretation seeks to occupy and fails, and fails the more the more it seeks, I have come to regard with a sympathy based on community of need: feeling that dissent from them results from inability to accept the solutions offered, joined with the wish that solutions could be found." It is a doubtful privilege to join the ranks of those who, in Lord Bacon's caustic phrase, "delight in giddiness, and count it a bondage to fix a belief." There are countless natures that prefer superstition to scepticism, and Rome in the last two generations has opened her ponderous gates to thousands of panic-stricken souls, who, like Newman, infinitely preferred grave doubts and misgivings regarding transubstantiation, Mary-worship, and Papal infallibility within her walls, under the restful shadow of her unquestioning assertion of the Catholic Faith, to the anxieties and responsibilities of a freer communion in which liberalism and criticism went unabashed, and every doctrine was subject to reconsideration and review.

"The fact is, Creeds and Confessions there must be. Faith, the very soul of Religion, though it embraces more than intellect, and listens to the persuasions of feeling as well as reason, cannot renounce the intellect, much less defy it, if it would attain to enduring certitude. As it moves, torch in hand, on its beneficent way down through the successive generations of old and young, learned and simple, filling the world with cheerfulness and power to endure, it cannot dispense with words and forms of thought such as the toiling masses, and all save a leisured few, yearn to receive for guidance and support. "There has been every variety of measure and manner of sobriety and of the reverse in the assertion of doctrine, and the embodiment of it in symbolical writings. But one thing cannot be doubted: a high Christian enthusiasm has usually been connected with strong and decided affirmation of doctrine, and with a disposition to speak it out ever more fully. That temper has been venturesome to speak even as it has been venturesome to do; as little fearing to declare God's Word in human speech, as to embody His will in human acts." There cannot be a gospel, or preacher's tidings for the saving of mankind, without an antecedent creed or body of belief, be it articulate or inarticulate. Preaching is the confident utterance of belief as well as of experience, and belief as distinct from knowledge always entails the recognition of things unseen and realities mysterious. If men are to enter pulpits, they must know in whom they have believed. The Book that accompanies them is a symbol of the assurance that should ring out unmistakably. And if men are to speak from a common platform and within a common organization, for the propagation and increase of Religion, they must have a common basis of faith, however limited, which may well be expressed in some form of public Creed. The phrasing of such articles is a task of consummate difficulty and delicacy, if many healthy minds are to be associated under them, still more difficult and delicate if many generations and many nationalities are to adhere to them without strain of conscience and sincerity. But it has to be done, and it ought to be done, and Christendom has no cause to regret that it has bestowed such long-continued labour on doing it."*

---

*W. A. Curtis,—Hist. of *Creeds and Confessions,* pp. 430-2 (T. & T. Clark).

The Doctrine in the Basis of Union

D.

WHAT MEN THINK OF THE DOCTRINAL BASIS.

The drawing up of the basis of union covered a period of five years, from 1904 to 1908 when it was presented to the Assembly in its practically completed form.* During those years and until 1915, when the basis of union was approved of a second, and thus far final, time by the Presbyterian Church,† the governing bodies, ministers, officials, and also the membership of the three negotiating churches, had ample time to study, criticize, and improve the basis. Our investigation has shown, however, that the original draft of the doctrine was only slightly changed in all those years. The changes were few and principally verbal;‡ no real departure having been made from the doctrinal compilation drawn largely from two ready-to-hand Statements of Faith, upon which the compilers were obviously almost wholly dependent.§

It is, therefore, a logical implication to conclude that not only the framers of the basis, but the vast majority of the aforesaid parties showed little real interest in the doctrinal basis.

As a matter of fact, there has always been, and still is, a wide difference of opinion as to the estimate to be put upon the doctrine and polity in the union proposal. This difference is not a question of unionist or non-unionist judgment. Both parties are divided in their general estimate, as well as in whatever attempts they have made at detailed criticism.

From a large and fortuitous collection of opinions, as to what men think of the doctrinal basis of union, I present here a number of examples. In order to constitute a real study of these opinions, I have tried to classify and analyse them under four heads:

---

*Chapter I, A.

†See 1911 and 1915 votes on the Basis in Chapter I, A.

‡Chapter III, B.

§Chapter III, A.

I. Opinions of Those Who Speak Very Lightly of The Doctrinal Issues Involved:

(*a*) An able Presbyterian minister, who belongs to the rising generation of specialized scholars,* writes thus: "I have not as much as read the basis of union. The explanation of this remarkable fact is probably that I am neither a theologian nor the son of a theologian." This statement was made in September 1922, although the basis had been before the church for nearly twenty years.

(*b*) Only the other day† I received, from a Methodist theologian this reply in answer to my question,—"In how far are the Methodist Standards of Faith in Canada, incorporated or departed from in the Basis of Union?"—"I cannot answer this question without making a comparison, which I have not time to do."

(*c*) Another minister writes: "It is in the nature of a compromise and therefore clumsy; but I satisfied myself years ago that there was nothing really objectionable in it and there I have rested. Creeds are not easily framed."

(*d*) A young and prominent preacher: "I have never given any real consideration to the doctrinal aspects of the basis of union. I used to have no great objection to the doctrinal part of the basis, because it seemed to me that the doctrine is largely Presbyterian, I have not changed my view since then to any serious degree."

(*e*) The minister of a large congregation: "I read the basis over, years ago but never since. I have no ideas now about it, that would be worth while as a contribution to your intensive study."

(*f*) A minister in the same galaxy of notable preachers: "I studied it cursorily years ago, but I have not even the vaguest recollections of any detailed conclusions."

II. Opinions Enthusiastically Favouring the Basis:

(*a*) A clever and beloved rural minister but an advocate of union at any price writes: "In my judgment the basis of union embodies practically all in doctrine and polity, especially in polity, that Presbyterianism has stood for. The basis has been most carefully constructed and critically examined, by the best theologians and executive officials of all three negotiating churches, and has been adopted by our General Assembly, under the Barrier Act, by an overwhelming majority, and under it decided on by the Assembly by a majority of four to one."

---

*With very few exceptions, I withhold names here, and I do it for good reasons both confidential and peace-loving; but I assert that I can substantiate, from my files, every opinion herein quoted.

†March 21, 1923.

(*b*) A Librarian: "The new creed represents a synthesis of doctrine, held historically, by the three churches, and a summing up in the form of a somewhat modern expression. It is a catholic and not an individual statement."

(*c*) Rev. Principal Patrick, the prime mover of the organic union scheme, said at the Hamilton Assembly these words in part: "The nineteen* Articles framed were a definite advance upon anything that was found in any of the three churches at the present moment. He admired the Westminster Confession, but it dated from the 17th century and they were in the 20th century, and he believed the nineteen Articles, submitted to them, were more truly scriptural than the Confession, in the sense that they were more religious and had less philosophy in them. They were written from a Scriptural standard. They stated the great fundamental truths of Christianity simply, and represented the convictions of living men. Everything that was vital in the Confession of Faith and in Christian doctrine and Christian life was to be found in these Articles."†

(*d*) Presbyterian Professor of Systematic Theology: "The doctrinal basis of union is the result not of latitudinarianism, or of indifference to vital religion, but of a deep interest in the Gospel as the only means of salvation, and a profound conviction that its proclamation is the primary function of the Christian church. It is the living faith of the Christian church, which is uttering itself in this document. It is this living faith which gives to the basis its value and its function. It is not a dead formula, it is a living voice. It is not a legal code, which would be of use in a heresy hunt, and would be of no other use whatever. It is an affirmation of faith, not a systematic presentation of all systems. (It is far too long; two or three sections would have been preferable).* Where Calvinism and Arminianism are at stake in the Basis, affirmations are made in common and differences ignored."

---

*The subsequent addition of an Article on Prayer, makes up the number Twenty Articles.

†Toronto Globe report, June 8, 1909.

(*e*) A well-known Western layman of the Methodist Church: "This basis of union which I support is a platform not to stand on but to get into union on."

(*f*) The chairman of the Union Committee 1922: "The union creed seems to me to be a compromise......The union question is a practical not an academic issue."

(*g*) An ex-moderator of the General Assembly: "The basis is the best that we could form under all the circumstances —better than any creed that ever preceded it. We must ever put teaching into practice to know its real value. (John 7: 17).—Hence Jesus is in harmony with the constitution of creation,—the United Church may and ought to make any change necessary to the highest good of men."

III. OPINIONS FAVOURING THE BASIS WITH QUALIFICATIONS:

(*a*) A Congregational Professor says: "The new credal basis is unnecessarily long and crowded with details. It is deficient in its recognition of modern social problems. No categorical subscription is our consolation."

(*b*) A Congregational official: "I think that, while I cannot give anything formal, the general feeling among our congregational men was of considerable disappointment at the doctrinal basis laid down. We were in hopes that in these days the doctrinal basis or creed would have been, as some one has put it, 'The working creed of a living Christian,' the brief simple devotional expression of faith which could have been used in our churches as a part of a joint service of consecration. Instead we have this creed, which is too long for recital, and which could only serve as a declaration of faith and as a basis for credal test. Apart from this, I think the doctrinal basis is regarded by our congregational men as a fairly orthodox statement, representing the general belief held by the majority of our people, although somewhat conservative in the view of our leaders."

---

*The bracketed words are the only criticism I was able to ascertain from this theologian who is a zealous advocate of organic union.

(*c*) An eminent Congregational preacher: "In the new credal basis for union there is no attempt at creating a creed, but simply the gathering together of points of theology which do not constitute burning questions. It is a fairly condensed view of the situation,—in so far so good. It is helpful and harmless, but when once it is presented to thinkers they oppose being pledged to it. That is, the new creed is all right for a crowd of non-thinkers. Yet it is a tremendous advance on old creeds, in so far as the new creed is made of milk and water, that is, there is nothing in it to fight for, nothing at stake, and this is much more suitable for modern religious thought which is in flux—always floating."

(*d*) The Principal of a Presbyterian College: "The credal basis is the best that could be framed meantime. The United Church will be free to modify or restate its creed, as a free church. It is more than a compromise. 'Let us find out how far we can go and can agree'—was the motive. It is a maximum statement of belief, in order to meet all shades of opinion within the church, from Calvinistic Presbyterians and literal Premillenarians to practically Unitarians. No confession of Faith is the same to every human mind."

(*e*) An eminent Presbyterian Professor: "Any basis of the kind must be a compromise with the spirit of 'give and take'. No party desires to sacrifice what it considers essential. As to doctrine, when I suggested amendments in our Presbytery, I was informed that it was not a new creed, but merely a general statement of faith, showing how closely the three churches could come together in their theology."

This reference to the necessity of compromise in matters of doctrine and polity in order to render organic union possible, recalls to my mind the prophetic words of the late Principal MacLaren of Knox College, spoken at the Kingston Assembly in 1905. "It was quite too soon yet, he said, to speak of the outcome of the movement, and he asked to guard the minds of his brethren against too bright hopes. It was found that the doctrinal positions of the churches interested were just the same as 50 years ago, and it would therefore be a great mistake to suppose all would be clear sailing. It seemed necessary to educate the ministers and even some of the professors on the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church. Unless they were prepared to recede from the distinctive position of the Presbyterian Church, he could not see how they were to succeed in Union."*

IV. Opinions Hostile to The Basis:

(*a*) The Principal of another Presbyterian College: "The credal basis is a compromise quite unworthy of intelligent men. It is true that a candidate is not required to give his assent to the letter of the doctrinal basis, but a great many of the younger and more liberal ministers of our church are thoroughly dissatisfied with such an antique production: for example—The story of the Garden of Eden is not treated as a pre-Christian Semitic poem but is laid down in coldblooded fashion as a matter-of-fact statement." "The polity is Presbyterian."

(*b*) A Methodist Professor is reported to have said: "If union is consummated, the united church will simply be an enlarged Methodist Church." "All admire the honesty of this observation," says my correspondent, "therefore the more distinctly doctrinal part has been amended and revised so that it is more notable for what it does not say than for what it does say."

(*c*) A Methodist Professor and member of the Committee that drew up the basis of union: "I was then and am still of the opinion that the effort to embody the distinctive doctrinal elements of the creeds of these churches, especially Methodist and Presbyterian was a mistake. Most of the twenty Articles could with advantage be dispensed with. The insistence on denominational fundamentals tends to diversity rather than unity—and to injure rather than help the spiritual life."

(*d*) A Missionary Convener in Western Canada: "My criticism is with regard to those features which fail to emphasize the great doctrines for which the Presbyterian Church has stood."

---

*Toronto Globe, July 14, 1905.

(*e*) A prominent Presbyterian Professor: "What fills me with gloomy feelings is that there is no appreciation in the basis of union, of the Church, of orders and of sacraments. The proportion of the new faith is not Presbyterian, it is not Wesleyan, it is an alien admixture."

(*f*) A leading minister: "I think the basis bears too much the marks of a compromise document. It very evidently was compiled by men of different theological views and its composite nature makes it somewhat unsatisfactory. It is too long. Beyond this, I think that it has too much the phraseology of the credal statements, and it would have been better to have used the language and the thought modes of the religious life and experience of our own day."

(*g*) Eminent Presbyterian Minister:* "The polity is purely Methodist and the doctrine a jumble of compromises wholly lacking in coherence. The whole thing is very inferior to the Presbyterian Standards."

(*h*) A minister of professorial qualifications, writes in poetic strain:

"Oh, subtle creed we need not believe;
Oh, faith we need not have;
Oh, polity we need not use;
Oh, stationing committee we need not use;
Oh, unity we do not feel;
Oh, blessed union that does not unite;
Oh, everything that nothing means."†

(*i*) The late Rev. Dr. Robert Campbell, clerk of the Presbyterian General Assembly, and a leader against organic union, wrote:

"It was indeed, surprising that so many of the ministers and elders voted in favour of the substitution of the 'Basis of Union' for the 'Confession of Faith', seeing that there is wanting to it the virile Pauline doctrine of Predestination, that there is in it no reference to the covenant made with Adam, and that particular election and particular redemption are not embraced in it. There is an absence of the outstanding truth of Effectual Calling and its doctrinal corollary of Perseverance, which have so largely entered into the domestic instruction of Presbyterians for centuries—which were calculated to confer spiritual dignity upon those accepting them, and which—it may be historically claimed,—imparted fibre to Presbyterians and begot in them a deep sense of moral responsibility. . . . The doctrinal sacrifice has prevented many Presbyterians from showing a keen desire for organic union. A much greater sacrifice is required of them, in this regard, than is required at the hands of Congregationalists, and Methodists. The Creed of the latter is in a less crystallized form than that of the Presbyterians, and has not bulked so largely in their ecclesiastical life, as the Confession and Catechisms have, with the followers of John Knox. . . . To good Presbyterians, the fault of the Basis of Union does not lie so much in what it embraces, as in what it excludes."*

---

*Now deceased.

†Report of Address, Pres. Convoc. 1916.

(*j*) A notable Montreal preacher† has written me these words:

"The new doctrinal point of view in the basis of union is in my judgment a rehashing of all the antique theology that was ever heard of, with here and there a slight bow to the liberal spirit. My first reading of it nearly plunged me in despair, and I should have found it entirely impossible to accept it, were it not for the fact that the formula for subscription for ministers leaves considerable elbow room for interpretation. Personally, I am strongly of opinion that any attempt to formulate doctrinal statements as a basis of union is futile and mistaken. It should be enough to state generally, that the basis of union is the catholic faith, as handed down in the great documents and understood in the light of a Spirit which is continually revealing the mind of God to mankind.

"I wish somebody would attempt to formulate the religious outlook, and try *that,* as a basis of union. I think that we shall unite in the end on the basis of the things that we are doing together, rather than on the opinions that we hold in common."

(*k*) A Western Professor of Systematic Theology, who is an ardent unionist declares: "The doctrinal basis of union has its ecclesiastical use, but doctrinally, and theologically, it is of very little value. It was not drawn up by experts in Theology, but by an ecclesiastic committee, who had no intention of making a new creed. They wished to effect a compromise between the creeds of the various churches. What is the use of analyzing a basis of union, that is theologically valueless and dead practically from its birth? It gives no one any light or leading, and simply avoids all contentious matter. It is neither negative enough nor positive enough—it is quite colourless and 'fushionless' (as the Scotch say)."

***The Relations of the Churches,* (Wm. Briggs, Toronto).

†Rev. Dr. Roberts, American Presbyterian Church. He is a unionist.

(*l*) An outstanding Toronto layman: "Our Presbyterian creed needs no defence. It is the best, the most logical, the most intellectual, the most profoundly spiritual of all. Calvinism has been the builder of strong character, liberty, law, education. We will retain it against the proposed church combine with its basis of compromise".

While my own opinions as to the doctrinal implications of the union movement are set forth at length in Chapter IV, I wish here to make a few comments with reference to the above display of other men's opinions on the basis:

1. The basis is unsatisfactory. It should be improved or discarded altogether and a new one made. If this is not done, it means that the present twenty Articles of Doctrine will become the Standard of Faith of the United Church by Act of Parliament. It means also that any change in the Articles of Doctrine thus adopted will have to be by an amending Act, which is neither easily nor quickly obtained, and besides it places the church in the humiliating position of having to ask the permission of Parliament to amend its doctrines.

2. For the purpose of accomplishing such a revision of the basis, a much more thorough and painstaking study, than has yet been given to the whole question of the doctrinal issues involved, is called for.

3. The opinions of those who speak lightly of the basis was a great surprise to me. My surprise passed over into a keen sense of disappointment when I discovered that even some men, of beautiful character and high repute as thinkers, had allowed twenty years of precious time to slip away without having studied seriously the basis, or without having made a comparison of it with the present doctrinal standards of the negotiating churches. The result is that they have no clearly defined judgment on these vital matters.

4. Among the men who express opinions favouring the basis with qualifications, and among those hostile to it, I believe we may find real life and hope. There we see men of intellectual calibre and strong spiritual convictions, who if they were to set themselves to the task of constructing a worthy basis, would be able to make a distinctive contribution towards the solution of this great question.

5. Three conflicting opinions stand out prominently:

(*a*) The claim that the doctrinal basis of union is the expression of the heart and mind of the living church and an unshackling of the bondage of dogma.

(*b*) The claim that instead of being the expression of a living faith it is theologically valueless. Many holding these views, in the Presbyterian Church, would prefer to retain the Westminster Standards, either in their present form or restated to suit present day conditions.

(*c*) A growing indifference to doctrinal issues which is characteristic of the present day, and which evidently so obsessed the minds of organic union leaders, that I feel justified in saying that the union movement in Canada represents very largely this non-doctrinal type of Christianity. From this I have drawn a very important deduction and elaborated it in Chapter IV, point (21), where I prove that such union logically calls for federal and not organic union.

The natural conclusion from all this is that one of two courses should be frankly recognized and followed. The first alternative would be to take the matter of doctrinal statement so seriously that a really worthy statement might be formulated which would be fit to take its place with the other historic creeds, which, like the Westminster Confession, are landmarks of theological progress. The second alternative is that if it be true that the real basis of union is not credal but practical and vital, then the place of importance should be given to some statement of Christianity in terms of particular duties, and of non-technical consecration of life. Unfortunately when we examine and analyze the basis of union, we do not find the slightest trace of such a statement. To illustrate this, and lest I be charged with partisanship, I shall call upon an ardent unionist and Western college principal to speak. He writes to me these words: "One would hardly suspect that the doctrinal basis of union was written when the various sciences were having their profound influence in reshaping our understanding of religion, and when the social interpretation of Christianity was receiving emphasis." It is this deficiency, too, is it not, that reveals the secret of why men find consolation in not being required to subscribe categorically to the doctrine in the basis of union, and why others demand a creed or affirmation of faith to which subscription would not be a hardship but a privilege? If organic union represents a practical and vital spiritual movement willed and guided from on high, we may well ask why then have the leaders of organic union not as yet been inspired to give us a concrete statement of Christianity in terms that will correspond to their professedly lofty ideal of religion? If they did this then, I am sure, they would enable men, of equal sincerity and spirituality, to grasp the content and meaning of the organic union movement. Such an interpretation of Christianity as a way of life rather than a statement of doctrine might again be of great historical importance. This need presents a noble challenge to these spiritual leaders, for such a statement might conceivably stand as a recognition of significant developments in our modern Christianity.

The Doctrine in the Basis of Union

E.

DENOMINATIONAL LOSSES AND GAINS IN UNION PROPOSAL.

1. CONGREGATIONAL LOSSES AND GAINS.

Introduction: What is Congregationalism?

"Congregationalism in Britain and America, a product of the English Puritanism of Elizabeth's reign, stands related historically to Calvinism very much as the Baptist movement, whose congregational form of polity and whose free attitude to Confessions of Faith it shares. Without confessional coercion, and without any reliance upon the ecclesiastical authority of high courts or assemblies, Congregationalism has grown up and flourished, like Baptist Calvinism, under the shadow and dominant influences of the Westminster Standards. It acknowledges no binding Confession. The particular or local congregation is a doctrinal law to itself, bound only by such doctrinal restrictions as may be embodied in its own constitution or charter or deed of trust. Particular congregations are bound to one another by the simple tie of fellowship, doctrinal sympathy, and affinity—a tie terminable at any time should egregious departure from type take place. Till recently, Congregationalists, like Baptists, have maintained a remarkable homogeneity in spite of their freedom—a testimony to their loyalty to the traditions not less than to the congregational charters of the body. They have steadfastly resisted all tendencies to elevate common doctrinal statements into obligatory Confessions, preferring to call them Declarations or "Platforms", and every temptation to form Presbyterian federations with legislative and jurisdictive courts. Neither civil nor ecclesiastical authority or dignity is allowed to exercise power over a local congregation. For the rest, their history has run parallel with that of Presbyterianism, their readjustments of the Westminster type of doctrine proceeding on similar lines."*

It has been the custom to speak of two principles as being fundamental to Congregationalism, independence and fellowship. They have been called the two foci of the Congregational ellipse. But we are disposed to consider that Congregationalism is a more perfect form of church organization than can be symbolized by the ellipse, and to regard fellowship as its one central principle. For fellowship can only exist in its truest and most perfect form between those who are mutually independent.

Fellowship takes the place of government. Government makes laws and punishes those who disobey them. Fellowship makes agreements, has understandings; those who do not keep the agreements violate the conditions of fellowship and ultimately destroy it.

As to the strength of fellowship as a bond of union, it has borne the test, and with reason. Bodies, either material or spiritual, which are held together by external bonds, may be violently ruptured. This has been experienced in the various denominations held together by creed and governments. The number of separate communions which bear the name of Presbyterian and Methodist are in evidence. They are the result of disruptions. The only separation from the Congregational fellowship has been in the case of the Unitarian churches.†

Methods of fellowship which were adequate between a limited number of churches located within a comparatively small area were insufficient when these churches came to be numbered by thousands and separated by thousands of miles. The value of the *pro re nata* Council has changed in comparison with conferences which have continuous existence and stated meetings, and the tendency is to increasing transfer from the former to the latter. The need has become felt of some voluntary continuous organization, within which the autonomy of each individual church should be assured. So from the local conferences of churches, the state associations (in the U.S.) naturally grew, and from them in turn the

---

**History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith*: W. A. Curtis, pp. 317-8. (T. & T. Clark).

†*The Congregational Way*: Geo. M. Boynton, (Pilgrim Press).

National Council was evolved composed of delegates from these smaller bodies.

The ministry has changed from the time when one was only considered to be a minister while he ministered to some local church, and when installation was in some sort a reordination. It has come to be a profession, in which the man once ordained has a standing of his own in the churches and in the ministerial associations.

Congregationalism has no adopted statements of belief to which it requires individual or church subscription. As expressing the general faith of the churches it has in turn referred to the Westminster Confession, as approved for substance of doctrine in 1648; to the Savoy Confession, substantially adopted in 1680, the Burial Hill Declaration adopted by the National Council in 1865, and the statement or doctrine of the Creed Commission of the National Council presented in 1883. These statements have become less philosophical and more practical. The Congregational churches are not anchored to a past statement, but are able to express their common faith in the language and the thought of the day, and to define their positions not for the purpose of cutting off those from whom they differ, but of uniting those who agree.

In its form of worship the Congregational churches show growth, variety and, in places, a tendency to a more liturgical worship. Doctrinal instruction and practical exhortation were the main objects of the coming together in the days of the fathers. Even the reading of Scripture was omitted or greatly curtailed, as part of the formal service against which the reaction had come. The great idea was simplicity and sincerity. But it has come generally to be realized that there may be sincerity in a fuller service, and that an atmosphere of worship is helpful to worship.*

WHAT THEN ARE THE CONGREGATIONAL LOSSES AND GAINS?

Historically, we have seen that Congregationalism both in England and New England stood for the Calvinist system. It had a part in England in the framing of the Wesminster

---

*Extracted from *The Congregational Way*: Geo. M. Boynton, (Pilgrim Press). See also Walker, pp. 189-237: Schaff, *Hist.* p. 836.

Confession of Faith, but for many years now the practice has been to substitute a simple, broad, evangelical statement for the old theological creeds. The latest of these is that of the National Council of Congregational Churches in the United States.*

The Canadian Congregationalists had hoped that a similar statement of doctrine would have been adopted in the basis of union. Their hopes were not realized as is seen in the somewhat elaborate statement that was framed. This was a loss to them, really amounting to capitulation.

But their protest against this is largely removed when in the section of the basis on the Ministry it was decided that no minister should be required to give unqualified subscription to this credal statement. This they claim to be a triumphant gain.†

I think the Congregational conception of the Church may be embodied in the following propositions:

1. That the Church is composed of true believers in Christ.
2. That to each member of the Church the Holy Spirit is given.
3. That each member should have freedom to make the most of himself for conduct and service under the guidance of the Spirit.
4. That the Christian life would have its primary and chief expression in that body of Christian people with which he is directly connected, that is, the local church.

It seems to me that this conception is in the basis of union. It is found in Article XV. "Of the Church"; also in paragraph 4 under "Polity", in the basis of union.‡

It is quite true that in the Basis we have a departure from the position of the old Independency.§ That position laid great stress on the autonomy of the individual congregation, although it has been modified to some extent by the formation of associations and unions. Yet to concede so much independency as the union proposal calls for is a very real sacrifice on the part of the Congregationalists. Happily their leaders believe that it is sometimes a part of freedom to give up freedom for what they deem to be a common good, and so they are prepared for a closer connexional bond than they have been accustomed to in the past.

---

*Appendix VI.

†Sect. III, sub-sect. 2, Basis of Union, (Appendix V).

‡Appendix V.

§See, *Studies in Religion and Theology*: A. M. Fairbairn, (Hodder and Stoughton), for Congregational Ideal (Independence), pp. 111 and 143; meaning of term, pp. 144-5; the early ideal, pp. 214, and 225; not sacerdotal p. 227. For a wide study of Congregationalism see Schaff, *Hist.* pp. 820 ff, and *Congregationalism* by Williston Walker (American Church History Series). Also Bibliography, Appendix VI.

The Congregationalists in Canada number but a few thousand in membership. They are a highly respected communion and are possessed of some very choice Christian leaders. Yet the fewness of their numbers, and the form of their government, did not offer much hope for expansion in the vast Dominion of Canada. It is true also that they were losing ministers to the Presbyterians. Therefore it seemed but a part of wise expediency for them to consent to and even to advocate organic union for their ecclesiastical and spritual future.

II. METHODIST LOSSES AND GAINS.

In order to form a proper estimate of Methodist Losses and Gains, one must first of all define Methodism. In defining Methodism, I shall purposely avoid an historical and theological exposition, that would be so academic and remote as to transplant the reader to alien lands and former centuries. This would have no obvious connection with the present situation. It is Methodism in Canada with which we are concerned. I shall take it for granted that the reader is conversant with the detailed beginnings of this remarkable movement in the Motherland,—a movement of moral and spiritual force that has wrought mightily during the last eighteen decades of human history with the world as its parish, so that to-day its followers number upwards of 30,000,000 souls; thus giving to this denomination probably the first place numerically among the Protestant churches of the world.

What, then, is Methodism?

Briefly stated, Methodism is a form of religious experience, and of church organization which took its rise mainly in the evangelistic preaching of John Wesley. The chief characteristic of its religious life is its emphasis upon definite experience of the divine pardon and sanctification, and the certainty of personal salvation witnessed to by the Holy Spirit. (Compare with full assurance of faith, inner light, and God consciousness, etc.).

"Coming immediately to the *contribution of Methodism to theology,* it must be freely admitted that its direct contribution to what may be called the science of theology has been slight. No one has, so far, arisen amongst us to rival John Calvin; no monumental work inviting favorable comparison with his 'Institutes' adorns the bookshelf of the Methodist preacher. Not indeed that valuable and instructive books on theology have been altogether wanting. From the days of Watson's 'Institutes' until now many have written in defence of the distinctive features of our doctrines, but it is no disparagement to these interesting and helpful writings to say that they have added little that is original to the philosophy of Christian theology.

"At least two reasons may be advanced for the fact noted.. .. The first and most potent is that early Methodism was too busily at work developing Christian experience and life to philosophize about it."....The accompanying reason is the fact that John Wesley took over without critical examination the theology of the Church of England, as expressed in her Articles and accepted Creeds, and likewise the view of the Bible common to Evangelicals of his day, as the infallible Word of God to be wisely interpreted but not critically analyzed. Anything resembling what we know as literary or historical criticism was not even dreamed of by him, nor with rare exceptions, by his followers for years after his death. By the exercise of a fine spiritual sagacity Wesley selected from Bible and creeds what served his purpose as an evangelist. In a noble sense he was a pragmatist before his time. The doctrines and texts that "worked", he absorbed and used: what did not lend itself to his mission as a soul saver he unconsciously disregarded.

"Religion, not theology or forms of worship, or church order, held the far larger place in his thought, and speculative theology had slight attractions for him. The refusal to require any doctrinal test for those who became members of his Society, and the absence of the remotest hint that doctrinal tests were important for church membership, point in the same direction."*

---

*Prof. S. P. Rose, D.D., Wesleyan College, Montreal in "The Genius of Methodism", *Ryerson Essays,* (Ryerson Press, Toronto, 1923).

"While the direct contribution to the science of religion has not been extensive or of great importance, the *indirect* influence of the Wesleyan revival upon Christian doctrine has been very considerable. Wesley and his associates set theology free from the shackles which a rigid Calvinism and a somewhat lifeless ecclesiasticism had bound about it. This has been done chiefly in two ways. First, by the strong infusion of the doctrine of Free Grace and Universal Salvation into Methodist preaching and hymnology, by reason of which Wesleyan theology became known as Arminian.* It is, of course, true that all of Wesley's colleagues did not follow him at this point. The story of the Calvinistic controversy is too familiar to require more than a passing reference here. But Methodism in the large repudiated the Calvinistic doctrine of election with all its logical consequences. It is hard for us to whom little of the old dispute remains beyond the sometimes warm but oftener dead ashes of the once hot fires of doctrinal controversy, to value at its full the contribution of Wesleyanism in this direction. It was, however, immense. It set theology free to live and move in a new atmosphere. It prepared the way for broader and more rational statements of truth. To those born into Methodism, particularly during the last half-century, it may seem fanciful to speak of the contribution Wesley made to what one might call practical as opposed to systematic theology as the new wine of new doctrine, and yet it was so in very truth.

"An acute observer, Sir Andrew Macphail, in an interesting article, in the now unhappily defunct *University Magazine,* has called attention to what he names the 'Universals of Methodism'. There are four of these: 'that all men need salvation, that all men may be saved, and know themselves to be saved, and that all may attain to holiness.' With the exception of the last, these 'universals' were familiar enough as statements of truth before Wesley was born, and even the doctrine of holiness of life had its strenuous advocates. They cannot, therefore, be regarded as new contributions to scientific theology. Nevertheless they were remarkable contributions to theology as a philosophy of right living. Very largely they were practically ignored or denied by many of the religious teachers when Wesley began his public ministry."†

These four 'universals' popularly described by Dr. Rose in the aforesaid quotations, and mentioned by me in more scientific terms in the definition of Methodism at the beginning of this section, will come up for further consideration in our discussion of Canadian Methodism. The point I wish to make here is simply this, that the leaders of Methodism in England had no desire to establish a new faith or a new church, but rather to revive the Church of England from within.*

---

*To neglect Charles Wesleys' hymns would be (in my judgment) to overlook the real creed of Methodism.

†Prof. Rose (Ibid).

To-day in Canada, "Education, evangelism, missions, social service, all teach the same lesson to a Methodist, namely, that the religion that does not go out, dies out. We are not merely missionaries to the non-Christians, but to everything unchristian. In short, let me pass on with a slight amendation of my own, a definition of Methodism which I once heard. It sums up in a word, the experimental and the intellectual, the individual, and the social, the human and the divine essentials of our Methodist faith. It is this: God is my life; I know it; I am glad of it; I want to tell you!"†

What is The Difference Between Canadian Methodism and Methodism In The Motherland?

There is this difference that in the Motherland Methodism is divided into several bodies, the chief and parent body being the Wesleyan Methodist, but there are also the Bible Christians, the United Brethren and the Primitive Methodists, and perhaps some other smaller branches.

I think that Methodism in Canada is a more homogeneous type, and that it resembles the Wesleyan Methodist more than the others, and yet of this I am not certain. The chief difference between the Methodism of Canada and the Methodism of England can be traced to the influence of American Methodism on Canadian Methodism. In zeal for moral reform by legislative action and specific prohibition the Canadian Methodists are more like the American Methodists than they are like the English. The Wesleyan Methodist Church holds a closer relation to Anglicanism in its type of worship than the Canadian Methodist Church does. In many Methodist churches in England the service of worship is practically that which is used in the Anglican churches in England. Not so at all in Canada.

---

*See Methodism, *Its History, Teaching and Government,* by G. S. Frazer, (Publ. House, M. E. Church, South, Nashville, Tenn.) For details, consult *"A New History of Methodism,"* and other works mentioned in Bibliography, Appendix XI.

†"Bean't You a Methody?" Lorne A. Pierce, (*The Christian Guardian,* Feb. 14, 1923).

In ecclesiastical polity Methodism everywhere maintains the itinerant system, although with great differences. In the United States in the Methodist Episcopal Church there is no time limit and the stationing is by the Bishop. Here it is by a Committee; and so also I believe it is in England by a Committee, and for a limited time both here and in England.

The Presbyterian Organization of Methodism.

"Methodism undoubtedly is Presbyterian in the main outlines of its organization, both in America and in England. This Presbyterian stamp was impressed upon it, curious as it may seem, by Wesley himself; unconsciously, no doubt for the most part. But Wesley's American 'bishops', his English 'superintendents', his system of 'stewards,' his annual 'Conferences', his 'quarterly meetings' of the ministers and laymen in every circuit, all fall in so closely with the Presbyterian system that the later division into synods, the later ordination of the ministers by the laying on of hands of the senior brethren, the later admission of the laity* to all, or almost all, the courts of the church have consolidated, not altered the work he began."†

It is interesting to note here the words of a Canadian authority on Church Government.‡

"On the question of Church government, Methodists have no fixed principles. John Wesley had no admiration for government by Kirk-sessions and Presbyteries, any more than he had for the manner of ordaining ministers or the administering of the communion or the burial of the dead in Scotland. He was a ritualistic Episcopalian; and, in the United States, the form of government which he started among his followers in that country, when he ordained a bishop and sent him to them, has continued until the present. For some time a section of the Methodists *in Canada* was also episcopally governed, although it was afterwards merged in a system much like that prevailing in England, a certain aristocracy called 'the stationing committee,' having the appointment of ministers to charges in their hands. The system of government prevailing in the Methodism of the Dominion is approximating more nearly to Presbyterianism, laymen now sharing in their conferences, local and general, al-

---

*To assume Pres. elders are laymen is disputed (see Rigg, *Church Organization,* 139 ff).

†H. B. Workman, D. Lit., 'Introduction' to *A New History of Methodism,* Vol. I, pp. 67-8, (Hodder and Stoughton, 1909).

‡Dr. Robt. Campbell, *Relations of the Christian Churches,* (Wm. Briggs, Toronto, 1913).

though there is at their head a permanent presiding officer, styled 'General Superintendent'."*

To sum up "In Polity, at least, Methodism has borrowed from Calvinism, not only in its practically presbyterian organization in Britain but in its conception of the episcopate as a superintending presbyterate in America. Practical elasticity and adaptability characterize its polity, just as spiritual impressiveness and emotional effectiveness mark its theology. Common sense rather than abstract consistency is the principle of both, appealing peculiarly to the English mind."†

"Methodism, as Dr. Chalmers characterized it, is 'Christianity in earnest.' It works powerfully upon the feelings; it inspires preachers and members with enthusiasm; it gives every man, and woman too, a distinct vocation and responsibility; it 'keeps all at work and always at it', according to Wesley's motto: it knows nothing of churches without ministers, or ministers without charges, as long as there are sinners to be converted in any corner of the globe. Methodism is better organized than any other Protestant denomination, and resembles in this respect the Church of Rome and its great monastic orders. It is a powerful rival of that church. It has efficient machinery with an abundance of steam, and is admirably adapted for pioneer work in a new country like America. It is a well-disciplined army of conquest, though not so good an army of occupation, since it allows so many 'to fall away from grace,' not only temporarily, but even 'totally and finally.' "‡

The Methodist Standards of Doctrine in Canada are:§

The fifty-two Sermons of John Wesley, along with John Wesley's Notes on The New Testament,¶ and the Twenty-five Articles of Religion. The Articles are selected from the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, and are slightly modified; the omissions being chiefly those of too Calvinistic a strain and those of too Sacramentarian a strain.||

---

*For a detailed analysis of Church Government in the Basis of Union, the reader is referred to Chapter V. In that chapter the differences between the Polities of the Canadian Meth. and Pres. churches is clearly shown.

†Curtis, *Hist. of Creeds and Confessions of Faith*, p. 329, (T. & T. Clark).

‡Shaff, *Hist. of the Creeds of Christendom*, p. 891 (Hodder and Stoughton).

§See Can. *Methodist Book of Disc*. 1918, p. 11.

¶The prescribed Text-book for Methodist students is Dr. N. Burwash's *Wesley's Doctrinal Standards*: *The Sermons*, (Briggs, Toronto).

||For the precise modifications see Curtis, *Hist. of Creeds and Confessions*, p. 330.

The candidate for the Ministry in the Methodist Church is examined in these Standards at an early stage of his student career. They form a kind of matriculation test for admission to the studies in theology. The candidates ordination vows are connected with experience and practice rather than doctrinal beliefs.*

As to how far Methodists actually depart from these standards, it is impossible for me to say. "For, whether we would have it or not, theological differences in the modern church utterly refuse to follow denominational lines. The radical, the moderate, and the reactionary belong to each and every Christian body, and their fellowship with one another will ignore sectarian boundaries."† Moreover I am told that a goodly portion of these standards are no longer taught in systematic form in some, if not all, the Canadian Methodist colleges. Again I have learned that the Presbyterian students, of a certain Presbyterian college in co-operation with a Methodist college, claim that the work in systematic theology which they are called upon to take in the Methodist college is very similar to that portion taken in their own Presbyterian college, for the simple reason that the Methodist professor is drawing his material largely from Presbyterian sources, e.g. Hodge's *Systematic Theology,* and various treatises written by other Presbyterians. On the other hand I was frankly but kindly informed by a Methodist professor that in the United Church John Wesley's doctrines of Christian experience and perfection would come to the forefront. I have also been informed that Methodist preaching still very largely corresponds to the theology of Wesley as set forth in the late Chancellor Burwash's edition of Wesley's Sermons.‡ The new Methodist hymnal also shows a marked increase in the number of Charles Wesley's hymns,§ and a corresponding decrease in the number of psalms; whereas the new Presbyterian hymnal just reverses this. There is here an arresting implication of inherent doctrinal difference still manifesting itself in these two denominations.

***Methodist Book of Disc.* pp. 367-8.

†Prof. S. P. Rose "The Genius of Methodism" (*Ryerson Series*).

‡*Wesley's Doctrinal Standards, The Sermons,* (Briggs, Toronto).

§The hymns of Wesley clearly indicate Methodist doctrine.

It should be noted that the Methodist standards of doctrine are binding only on the ministers. The members are not bound by them, although there is a form of reception service in the Discipline which asks certain doctrinal questions.* To do so, however, was to depart from the original spirit of Methodism, which states that there is no condition for membership except a "desire to flee from the wrath to come and to be saved from one's sins."

Many people outside Methodism *do not distinguish between standards of doctrine and the rules of the Church.* The rules of the Church are altogether practical and ethical, and were drawn up by John Wesley. They can be found in the Discipline. It was as a foot-note to these rules that there appeared the specific prohibition of dancing, card-playing, theatre-going, attending horse races etc., etc. This footnote was removed about twelve years ago by vote of the General Conference, and in its place was substituted a purely spiritual interpretation of them.

In how far are Methodist Standards of Doctrine departed from or incorporated in the Basis of Union?

This question requires a thorough analytic study and comparison before any answer can be given. This I have made, with what success the reader may judge for himself. As a result of this investigation I give it as my decided opinion that the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches, in the event of organic union being consummated, will thereby set aside their respective standards of faith. These will be replaced by the Twenty Articles in the Basis, which are taken very largely from two Presbyterian norms, with interjected parallelisms of Methodist doctrine which do not fuse.† The preamble does not save the situation for it is contradicted by the summary of doctrines which it introduces.‡ It is easy, however, to find definite traces of the Methodist standards here and there in the basis of union, e.g.

1. Article II,—*Of Revelation.*—This illustrates an effort to preserve something of the creeds of the Methodist and Pres-

---

***Methodist Book of Discipline*, 1918, pp. 340-1.

†See Chapter II. B; II. D; IV; and Addendum I., for ample proof of this assertion.

‡See Addendum I.

byterian Churches. It is an elaboration of Article II. of the Brief U. F. Statement, with a view to reflecting Chapt. I. of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and I. 5 of the Methodist Catechism.

2. Article V.—*Of the Sin of Man,*—is another compromise. It is a toning down of Chapt. VI. Westminster Confession, to which III. 19 of the Methodist Catechism corresponds, whereas the Methodist Article VII, of Religion, is less crude.

3. Article VI.—*Of the Grace of God,*—is another example of eclecticism. In the merging of Articles VI. and VII. of the U. S. Statement, in order to make this Union Article VI, the U. S. Article title 'Of Election' was dropped to avoid controversy. Again in order to meet the Methodist emphasis on the universality of the Atonement, which was made so much of by Methodist evangelism in opposition to Calvinistic Election, the Union article speaks of full and free salvation for all. Nevertheless it proceeds to declare that this salvation is for an innumerable (not unchangeable, any longer) multitude *chosen,* etc. Compare Westminster Confession Chapt. X; Meth. Catechism V, 26; and Articles of Religion XX.

4. Article VII.—*On the Person of Our Lord,*—This Article is taken from the Brief American Statement of the Reformed Faith (See Appendix I). It is conspicuous for its omission of the historic formula "Two natures in one person," which has for centuries been the key words of doctrine. The Article then proceeds to define our Lord's nature, not in metaphysical terms but in terms of the function of Christ's person. (Further in Article VIII. On the Holy Spirit, while flavoured with metaphysics, it again wisely follows the American creed by using the words "Lord and Giver of Life," an ancient expression but with modern implications).

To me this is a result and tribute to the modern pragmatic and psychological methods of thought which are dominant to-day. The student Christian Association, in its statement concerning Christ is, on the same practical line, although the terms I hear them using are more ethical and spiritual perhaps than psychological. For Christ to them is perfect goodness, the completed and realized human ideal, the example for the inspiration of humanity. All this marks the drift from older metaphysical concepts of substance and nature and law, the last of these being strongly pronounced in Calvinism. Methodism inherited, of course these metaphysical concepts and her theologians, so far as she had any, were quite content to work with them. Personally, however, I think Methodism takes to the more practical and ethical concept of Christ with less disturbance than the older historic Churches. This Article also touches upon the Methodist doctrine of universal atonement, e.g. "for the sins of the whole world".

5. Methodism regards highly the doctrine of the *Witness of the Spirit.* The phrase, "Full assurance of Faith" (Art. XII.—"Of Sanctification") was in her eyes too tame—too naturalistic to define the sudden experiences of rapture which accompanied the true-to-type conversion. Moreover, Methodism preached—although it got into no creed—that none were truly saved without this critical experience of divine testifying. It grew out of what to-day is no doubt a crude deistic mode of thought. God was in heaven afar off. Forgiveness took place up there in the "Courts of Justice and Mercy." "How could a sinner know on earth his sins forgiven," how could the news be transmitted? Well, the doctrine of the "Witness of the Spirit" was the answer to so practical a question. Notice how this doctrine affects the statement of the Union Creed—namely, in effect, it reads: 'Are entitled to all the privileges of sonship' 'including the witness or knowledge of sins forgiven (Articles XI. XII)'. When the Committee was discussing this doctrine, Dr. Burwash (Methodist) would have liked the stronger statement. Dr. DuVal (Presbyterian) thought this quite sufficient. He said the concrete application of such a doctrine as Methodism emphasized depended too much on temperament. Some were sanguine and easily arrived at a subjective certainty. Others were doubters, etc., etc.

6. Article XII,—where it touches upon the doctrine of *Christian Perfection* or *entire Sanctification,* shows the influence of another doctrine which Wesley preached—although with many explanations and limitations. A staunch Presby-

terian remarks: "Note the extravagance of the concession to the Methodists, that we may have assurance of possessing the perfect love of God."

7. Article XIV.—*'Of the Law of God',*—was inserted because of the insistence of the Methodists, for an Article in the interests of Christian ethics. cf. VI. Methodist Catechism and Chapt. XIX. West; Conf. A Methodist professor writes me that this "Union Article XIV is also an illustration of the inadvisability of attempting to preserve something of the creeds of both churches".

8. Article XV.—*On Baptism,*—caused the only serious division in the committee on Doctrine. The Methodists, (whose Catechism, VIII, 64, reads, "The proper subjects of baptism are infants and adult believers") were prepared to defend their position, that a child should be baptized for its own sake irrespective of the parents' character or church membership. The Presbyterians (whose Shorter Catechism (95) reads: "Baptism is not to be administered to any that are out of the visible church, till they profess their faith in Christ and obedience to Him; but the infants of such as are members of the visible church are to be baptized") would not allow the loose view of the Methodists to prevail. General Superintendent Carman of the Methodist Church persuaded his brethren to adopt the Presbyterian view, and suggested the middle clause of the Union Article to which all agreed.

WHAT, THEN, ARE THE METHODIST LOSSES AND GAINS?

Before giving my own estimate I shall give several examples of answers from many prominent Methodists,—officials, clergy and laymen, received in letters or in personal interviews. All those whom I quote are unionists. In fact I have not come across one Methodist "anti-unionist" in all my investigations; although they are to be found, I am authoritatively informed.

To what extent there is opposition I do not know. It appears to me, however, to be feeble, since no attempt has been made to give it expression in organized form, such as those opposed to organic union are doing in the Presbyterian Church, through Presbyterian Church Associations, for men and women respectively.

So divergent and mixed are the Methodist answers, that I can only organize them roughly as follows:

1. *General Statements.*

(1) "I do not see that the Methodist Church has anything special to gain by the proposed union." (Methodist official).

(2) "I have not the slightest knowledge of the proposed constitution of the United Church. I have never been in the least degree interested in ecclesiastical polity." (Prominent preacher).

(3) "I am thinking very little of Methodist gains or losses if any." (A leading preacher).

(4) "So far as our Methodist Church is concerned, I think we stand, on the whole, to gain very much more than we shall lose." (An able professor).

(5) "In my opinion none of the contracting churches will either gain or lose in doctrine or even in polity should the Union be consummated." (Vigorous preacher).

2. *As to Doctrine.*

(*a*) "The sharp contrasts and antagonisms which undoubtedly existed fifty years ago and less, in the attempt to present a true interpretation of the Christian faith in the Presbyterian and Methodist communions respectively have largely ceased to exist; otherwise the union of these two churches would clearly not even have been dreamed of or attempted. The position to which we have been brought in respect of doctrine is not at all due to an effort on either side to modify cherished convictions to meet the demands of the other. What has really happened is that both churches have been brought into a new world of thought and have learned to approach the whole question of doctrinal statements in a new spirit and from other standpoints than those which prevailed fifty years ago. Perhaps no feature of the old method was more marked than the attempt in all the churches to build up a doctrinal statement upon isolated passages of Scripture. The very opposite method obtains to-day in each of the churches. The union, if it takes place, will rather be the registration of progress already made in the directions indicated than positive achievement in respect of doctrine. This will be a distinct gain." (Methodist Professor).

(*b*) A leading Methodist clergyman, who was a member of the Committee charged with the responsibility of framing the

Doctrinal Basis of Union, stated to me these facts, which I jotted down during a private interview.

"From the beginning of doctrinal discussion in Committee of negotiating churches, the question was—How could we harmonize Calvinism and Arminianism? At first this was discussed with bated breath, trembling hope and anxious fear, but this was overcome by a Pentecostal spirit showing itself in consideration, patience, regard, and goodwill. This was yearly so, though naturally we have experienced ebbs and flows, but the movement has been always onward.

"How we got round the doctrinal difficulty:" We stated both views in Scriptural language and left it at that. Quarrel if you will with the New Testament was our loophole. Ephesians Chapter I. was very useful and handy. A Methodist could not go back on it.

"The Result: The new Basis is, therefore, mechanical. It does not harmonize. It is not a theological or metaphysical master work. There was no organic union of doctrine. The aim was comprehensive. Distinctive points of view of Methodism, Presbyterianism and Congregationalism, were set forth in Scriptural language, (at the expense of logic).

"Some, wanted a new expression of Christianity, shorter, simpler, purely vital, an inevitable expression of its truth, but the majority thought they found this not practical because too many were wedded to the old. Therefore an elaborate creed (with no subscription) was compiled with a view to covering the whole field.

"No mention is made of the Social Gospel in the new Creed. It was not in the mind of the framers. The Creed is unfortunately made from without and not from within. It is compacted, not evolved. It is a queer creed.

"It is not at all a vital organic expression of the real living Church of to-day. It is 20 years old, and is no more vital than the Westminster Confession nor the Twenty-five Articles of Methodism, etc."

(*c*) A Methodist Professor of Systematic Theology writes to me this noteworthy comment:

"I have always regarded this approach of the churches to one another in polity and doctrine as the strongest proof of the Divine character of the movement.

"I have no authority to speak for the Methodist Church but having been a member of the committee that drew up the 'Basis of Union' I was then, and am still of the opinion that the effort to embody the distinctive doctrinal elements of the creeds of these churches, especially Methodist and Presbyterian, was a mistake. Most of the nineteen Articles could with advantage be dispensed with. All that is necessary is a brief creed setting forth,

(*a*) Our belief in the existence of God.

(*b*) His relation to man in the world.

(*c*) The fundamental character of the teachings of Jesus Christ.

"Articles II., V., XII., and XIV., are illustrations of the efforts to preserve something of the creeds of the Presbyterian and Methodist churches to which I have referred. Insistence on such statements as of fundamental importance would tend to diversity rather than unity and injure rather than help the spiritual life."

3. *As to Polity*:

"In this area there will be changes, but whether they will be gains or losses it is difficult at this stage, if not quite impossible, to say. As far as the individual congregations go the changes will be very slight, and thus there will be neither serious gain nor loss. In the realm of what Methodists call connexional administration, the various departments of the Church will suffer very little change. Each of the communions concerned in the proposed Union now carries on its work in specifically the same fashion. The one serious element to be faced in the Methodist Church as compared with the other churches is that of the general superintendency. I am sure that there are differences of opinion in the Methodist Church as to the value of the general superintendency, but I am under the impression that if a vote were taken in their constituency to-day, the decision would be strongly favourable to its retention. I am also under the impression that quite apart from other reasons of a less practical but much more theoretical character, the intensity with which the episcopacy is being stressed in many quarters of the earth to-day is due to a conviction of the great value to any Church of having a man or a group of men set apart specially to give oversight to the activities of the Church. If the Union Church has no such man or group of men, then perhaps this element may be placed among the losses from the Methodist standpoint, although I am not in this expressing a personal opinion. There are many ministers in the Methodist Church at the present time who firmly believe that the Methodist Church is unduly influenced by its connexional officers, including the General Superintendent and the various Secretaries of the Boards; and by such men it is strongly maintained that the Presbyterian system in these respects is superior. If the views of these men are sound, then the new order into which the Union would bring them would be even from a Methodist standpoint, a gain." (Prominent Methodist official).

"In the important matter of stationing of ministers the new polity is designed to provide for the supply from year to year of vacant charges, and the utilization of the available men, and a permanent pastorate wherever that seems to be desired. In this regard the Methodists would gain by escaping the faults of congregational independence on the one hand, and of mechanical change on the other." (Methodist Professor).

4. *As to Practical Co-operation at Home and in the Foreign Field.*

(*a*) "There will be a gain in the conservation of resources, and from unified direction in the common denominational purposes for the betterment, which can be secured through the activity of the Church." (A notable layman, a Union leader).

(*b*) "I am not sure that the changes in Doctrine and Polity will make any vital difference. There is, however, no question in my mind but that energies and resources which are urgently required to meet more vital and larger needs are being expended in unnecessary competition or duplication of work, and that if the Church is to measure up to her task in this period of human history it can only be through greater unity in spirit and in effort." (A leader among laymen, and a prime mover for Union).

(*c*) "In the area of Foreign Missions the Union will make but the very slightest changes inasmuch as it may be expected that the work existing on the fields now occupied by the respective churches will be maintained and developed. As there is no overlapping in the foreign fields the gains and losses which will grow out of Union may be considered as negligible, save in one important respect. If the Union takes place the combined foreign activities of the uniting churches will give the new church a distinctly more significant status in the Christian world, and it is almost inconceivable but that the young people especially, of the new church would have marked added inspiration from the sense of the greatness of the mission in the world of the united church to which they belong.

"I believe it is within Canada itself that the main immediate gains will be realized. The weakness of our present position in attempting to meet the situation in Canada, especially in the Western parts of our land, are so obvious as to require no more than mention.

"Of course, the gains which Unionists hope to realize by the Union will be neither Methodist, Presbyterian nor Congregationalist; they will be Canadian and Christian gains." (Methodist official).

5. *The Writer's Estimate of Methodist Losses and Gains in the Union Proposal.*

(1) The above communications and interviews, as well as the fact that there is no organized opposition to Union in the Methodist Church, implies that the vast majority of Methodists believe that they will gain more than they will lose.

(2) Those of their number, who say they do not care what Methodism will lose or gain, so long as the kingdom of God is advanced, do certainly strike a high spiritual note. A moment's reflection, however, will show that such a position is logically untenable on the part of those who believe that Methodism is not as yet a spent force, but still has a distinctive contribution to make to Canadian Christianity. They are, therefore, challenged by their own statements to prove that Methodism can do better work when organically united with Presbyterians and Congregationalists than by Federal Union or a large scheme of Christian co-operation. This proof they have not as yet given in any of the numerous letters addressed to me, nor in the many kindly interviews which they so generously have granted to me.

(3) My impression honestly arrived at is, that these Methodist organic unionists like Presbyterian organic unionists, presuppose that all will work out well, under the guidance of God, in what is to them also a great adventure of faith, e.g. Organic Union.

(4) As to Doctrine:

The Basis of Union had as its norm two Presbyterian Statements of Faith, which represent modified Calvinism.* Into this Basis distinctive Methodist doctrines have been interjected in about six or seven instances. They do not, however, logically blend with these Articles, to which really they are parallels and not integral parts. On this account the doctrine in the Basis has been described as compromising eclecticism. It has been described by a Methodist College Principal to me, in effect, as "a compromising eclecticism with a view to making a Statement of Faith, compiled from the best of our denominational creeds, and in such a way that the doctrines compiled will not clash. Unfortunately, so many years have passed since the Basis was first drawn up that it is now obsolete, its language is mediaeval and its permanent adoption as a doctrinal basis for a United Church would be reactionary."

---

*Chapter III. A.

It is for Methodists to decide whether the adoption of the Union doctrinal Basis is a loss or a gain, as compared with their present Standards of Faith. I have learned that some Methodist thinkers intend to ask for a revision of the credal Basis, but not before Union, lest it be retarded. A leading layman is reported to have said: "This Union Creed is a platform to get into union on but not to stand on."* This instead of an honest and bold attempt before Union to make a fresh statement of doctrine expressive of the living faith of to-day is, in my judgment, an unmistakeable loss.

"The Basis gives scope for the old Evangelism. Should this disappear in the Methodist communion, as the result of Union, that, would be greatly deplored. But I do not really fear that this spiritual loss will follow from Union." These are the words of a Methodist Professor; and yet I myself am not certain but that Union will dilute the mighty evangelical power which has always been the characteristic of Methodism. In so far as that result should follow from organic union, Canada and the world will lose, spiritually. This loss need not come, nor even be dreaded, for by Federal, not Organic Union, all this uncertainty and danger could be avoided.

The fact that there is no definite credal subscription in the doctrinal Basis is also a distinct loss to the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches alike. It is inconceivable to my mind that any church, not to mention the prospective big United Church, should entertain for a moment the fallacy of so grave an omission. Moreover the present ordination questions of the Methodist Church far excel the crude and paltry ones in the basis of union.*

---

*See Chapter III. D.

Our whole study goes to show that the union movement, with Methodists as with Presbyterians, is a non-theological, not doctrinal affair.

(5) As to Polity: While the doctrine is more largely Presbyterian than Methodist, the polity is predominantly Methodist. My analysis (Chapter V) makes this evident. Therefore the gain will rest with the Methodist Church in polity. This is a matter of vital concern, because if the movement is non-doctrinal, and confined largely to motives and work in common, then logically it follows that Church government not doctrine counts for most as a gain or loss.

(6) The inevitable disruption in the Presbyterian Church that will follow Union will have a direct effect upon the Methodist Church merged in the United Church. If the division in the Presbyterian Church is substantial, then the Methodist majority in the United Church will be able to command entirely the policy of the United Church, so far as the church courts are concerned, and the Presbyterians who enter Union will be a strong addition to the Methodist forces. Yet it must not be forgotten that years of litigation and strife may follow Union. Will the Methodists in the United Church be willing to help their new Presbyterian allies, financially, in the struggle against the Presbyterian "minority"? Moreover will Christian co-operation receive a serious setback by this inevitable disruption? Who can tell? It has yet to be considered very seriously if such disruption, confusion, bitterness and apparent loss might not be wholly avoided, by Federal rather than Organic Union. I for one believe Christian statesmen, of the negotiating churches, should immediately take up this problem, which as yet has never been seriously considered. On the other hand if the split in the Presbyterian Church is insignificant, the Methodists will gain from an economic point of view, but I am not at all sure that their fervent spiritual power will

---

*Chapter III. C.

be increased, by association with Presbyterians who have divided their own spiritual household.

Too many matters, also, are left to be decided after Union, for any Church to be certain as to denominational losses or gains.

The Doctrine in the Basis of Union

E.

DENOMINATIONAL LOSSES AND GAINS IN UNION PROPOSAL.

III. PRESBYTERIAN LOSSES AND GAINS:

By way of preparation for our study of Presbyterian losses and gains in the union proposal, I shall give the best brief *definition of Presbyterianism* I know of, selected from among a variety of conflicting opinions. This definition has the merits of accuracy and completeness. It reads as follows:

"The name 'Presbyterianism' may be applied in a general sense to that theory of the Church which aims at realizing its visible unity through government by presbyters, clerical and lay, such presbyters being set apart by their peers without popular consent, being all of equal status, and being organized for purposes of ecclesiastical administration into Church Courts, which rise one above another in an ascending scale, from the congregational to the national. In a sense more particular 'Presbyterianism' is used to denote the concrete effort after the realization of that idea which, originating in the work of John Calvin, was elaborated by those who followed him into a definite form of church organization, with a distinctive type of doctrine, morals, and ritual, and which in one form or another counts perhaps 100,000,000 adherents to-day. Presbyterianism seeks to avoid, on the one hand, the absolute subjection of individual congregations to government from without and above, and, on the other, their absolute independence of all restraint. Of the three great types of Church government it is therefore the middle one, between Congregationalism and Episcopacy."*

Some one has pointedly said:

"Presbyterianism means organized life, regulated distribution of forces, graduated recognition of gifts, freedom to discuss, authority to control, agency to administer. Presbyterianism means a system by which the convictions and conscience of the Church should constantly be applied by appropriate organs to her affairs. Presbyterianism means a system by which the quickening influence anywhere experienced could be turned into effective

---

*The late Professor John Dall, of Queen's Theol. College, Canada, (*Encylopedia of Religion and Ethics,* Vol. X, p. 244).

force, and transmitted to fortify the whole society. Presbyterianism means a system in which every one, and first of all the common man, has his ascertained and guarded privileges, his responsibilities inculcated and enforced,—feels himself a part of the great unity, with a right to care for its welfare and to guard its integrity. From the broad base of the believing people the sap rose through Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, to the Assembly; and thence descending, diffused knowledge, influence, and organic unity through the whole system. Yes! Presbyterianism is a system for a free people, that love a regulated, a self-regulating freedom,—a people independent, yet patient, considerate, trusting much to the processes of discussion and consultation, and more to the promised aid of a much forgiving and watchful Lord."*

The Standards of The Presbyterian Church in Canada.

Presbyterianism in Canada is practically the same as that of the Mother Church of Scotland, in doctrine, government, and discipline, under authority to Christ alone, the Head of the Church, and Head over all things to the church. The standards to-day are the standards which were adopted as the basis of the Presbyterian union of 1875, namely:

(1) The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, being the Word of God, are the only infallible rule of faith and manners.

(2) The Westminster Confession of Faith shall form the subordinate standard of this church; the Larger and the Shorter Catechisms shall be adopted by the Church and appointed to be used for the instruction of the people; it being distinctly understood that nothing contained in the aforesaid Confession or Catechisms, regarding the power or duty of the civil magistrate, shall be held to sanction any principles or views inconsistent with full liberty of conscience in matters of religion.

(3) The government and worship of this Church shall be in accordance with the recognized principles and practice of Presbyterian Churches, as laid down in the "Form of Presbyterian Church Government" and in "The Directory for the Public Worship of God."†

Let us now discuss Canadian Presbyterianism under three main headings, and in dealing with each of these let us note carefully the estimated gains and losses in the union proposal.

---

*Quoted by Rev. Marcus Scott, *Presbyterianism, Its Nature, Struggles and Successes,* (Mattice & Baker, Detroit, 1897).

†*Rules and Forms of Procedure Pres. Church in Canada,* p. 69.

I. Presbyterian Emphasis In Doctrine, In Canada.

(1) In many quarters ministers and teachers have laid little or no emphasis on doctrine. This has rendered a non-doctrinal organic union movement possible. A clear deduction from this is that one cannot single out a definite emphasis on doctrine or doctrines by the Church as a whole.

(2) Probably a majority of those opposed to union, however, are orthodox, but not in the narrow sense of being literalists or formalists in credal subscription. With very few exceptions, these persons subscribe not to the form but to the spirit of the Westminster Confession of Faith, with its great variety of implications that allows for the expansion and unfolding of the truth. The term "Fundamentalists" in the technical sense cannot be applied to them, for that would give the false impression that these non-organic-unionists were extreme and reactionary literalists, like the so-called "fundamentalists" in the United States. Rather do they recall with pride the historical fact that the founders of their denomination were great theologians, and that their church has been illustrious for thoroughness and strength in the intellectual and spiritual expression of her doctrinal convictions throughout her history. So that naturally Presbyterians have always associated the vigour of their church's life with doctrine, just as much as with polity. At the same time, it is true that, on the "anti-unionist" side, there has not been seen any disposition to strictness or intolerance in regard to the student, preacher or professor, who presents truth on modern lines of thought. The objection to the doctrinal basis does not emanate from "gushing orthodoxy", but from the judicial verdict that the basis is an archaic, weak, and superficial substitute for the thorough and strong Westminster Standards. Non-unionists would welcome an adequate revision of these standards, but strongly object to the basis, because it sacrifices the thoroughness and strength, for which Presbyterian doctrine has heretofore been noteworthy.

(3) There has been for years an undefined movement in the Presbyterian Church to revise the present standards or to amend the terms of credal subscription. This has not represented any solid party within the church but rather individuals,

who are making these demands. These men feel that doctrines expressed in the terms of the seventeenth century are repugnant to the general consciousness of our time. It is not that they are objecting to any individual doctrine, so far as I have been able to ascertain, but rather to being hampered by subscription to what seems to be a subscription to the form and not to the spirit of the Standards of Faith.

(4) It is very important to note that, in one form or another, almost every shade of opinion upon doctrinal questions, which has affected the Presbyterian Church worldwide, is more or less reflected in the Canadian Church, so that this Church really cannot claim to have any denominational national peculiarities in its expression of the Faith.

(5) There is this to be said, however, in contradistinction to British and American Presbyterianism, that the Canadian branch has held to the Westminster Standards of the Church of Scotland, without the modification or toning down of doctrine, such as is the fact in regard to the English and American Articles of Faith, which, as we have seen in Chapter III, A, are the main sources lying behind the present basis of union.

Presbyterian Gains in Doctrine in Union Proposal.

In Chapter III, D, we saw that there was wide dissatisfaction with the proposed basis of union. There are a few unionists, however, who claim union would bring gains even in doctrine. I shall now illustrate this point by giving either verbatim quotations or the gist of statements by these unionists:

(*a*) Rev. Principal MacKinnon, Pine Hill College, Halifax, states in a published pamphlet:*

"Denominational bias is held in abeyance (in the doctrine of the basis). Truth is seen in better perspective. Such we feel to be the peculiar merit of this brief presentation of Christian doctrine.

"As the faith which was once delivered unto the saints is incapable of change in its essence, the basis does not attempt to supplant, but to absorb what is of eternal value in the creeds that have gone before. The historic verities, for which the Church has battled and shed her blood, retain their place as a permanent possession. 'We acknowledge,' it is said in the preamble, 'the teaching of the great creeds of the Ancient Church.' The Trinity and the Divinity of Christ are as firmly held as ever. Of God it is said, 'We worship Him in the unity of the Godhead, and the mystery of the Holy Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, three persons, of the same substance, equal in power and glory.' Of our Lord it is declared that He is 'the Eternal Son of God' and 'for us men and our salvation became truly man, being conceived of the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary, yet without sin.'

---

*Appendix XI, 6, (b) (7).

"To the evangelical doctrines of the Reformation the basis especially asserts its allegiance. The Bible maintains its unquestioned authority. 'We receive the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, given by inspiration of God, as containing the only infallible rule of faith, and life, a faithful record of God's revelations, and as a sure witness to Christ.' Nor has modern liberal Theology in any way weakened belief in the Atonement. . . . The way of salvation through justification by faith, for which the Reformers battled so bravely, is fearlessly professed.

"Further citation is unnecessary to show with what fidelity this modern summary of Christian truth clings to those vital beliefs and hopes, that are the priceless heritage of our religion and that have been cherished alike by Methodist, Congregationalist and Presbyterian."

(*b*) *Wherein are Presbyterian doctrines preserved in the Basis of Union?*

A Presbyterian Professor of Systematic Theology who is an ardent unionist, and has little or no criticism to offer of the basis answers:

"The Church of Scotland with which we are chiefly concerned as a daughter thereof has stood for:

"I. The Catholic Faith; of which the Nicene symbol is the 'sufficient' expression. (Lambeth). (See the Preamble of the Basis of Union).

"II. The Reformation Position; including:

1. The Priesthood of believers } (Article XI., implied also
2. Justification by faith } in Articles VII and XIII).
3. The authority of the "Word of God," Article III. (See Lindsay's History).

"III. Calvinism:

1. Emphasis on Divine Transcedence. Article III.
2. Election to Life. Article VI (b).
3. Reprobation or Preterition.

"The doctrinal basis includes all these except III, 3; and this is a logical inference, not a Christian verity; and I know no Theologian outside of Princeton, who presses it as an element in Christian Faith."*

This man feels that the doctrinal basis preserves Presbyterian essentials, and gains by simplification and modification of the Westminster Standards. He claims it is an affirmation of the faith of the living church to-day.

(*c*) We noted in Chapter III, C, that there are those who consider that no credal subscription to the basis of union is a gain.

(*d*) "The doctrinal basis gains in brevity, accessibility, and Christian tone."

As to doctrine,—a simpler form of credal statement might help the ordinary church member. The theologically untrained person finds in the proposed basis certain fundamental and necessary doctrines. These include at least (*a*) the inspiration of the Bible as a basic revelation, (*b*) the Fatherhood of God, (*c*) Redemption by the Son, (*d*) and the gift of the Holy Spirit. There can be no doubt that the doctrinal basis gains chiefly in brevity and accessibility. Our Confession of Faith is a great document, but as the outcome of our enriched scholarship with new light of great value from historical and biblical criticism and modern science, the Westminster Standards are found to include statements that are not fundamental or even applicable to-day, and unduly lengthy at times for the ordinary reader. It was composed in controversial times, and carries with it that complexion. The present time being much freed from those historic factors, it is fitting that old time prejudices should be eliminated. To a limited extent, this contribution has been made in the new doctrinal basis despite the criticism of its being a compromise document containing archaic expressions. "The rigid interpretation of certain sections of the Westminster Standard such as predestination, whilst perhaps intelligible to the theologically trained, is not intelligible and has proved repellant to the untrained. The language in the basis of union approaches more that of to-day, with the kindlier spirit of our own time. The new creed recognizes different phases of truth without attempting philosophical interpretations or reconciliations. It is sufficiently brief to place both its doctrine and polity in the hands of the people."

---

*Private letter.

(*e*) Methodists claim their contribution to the united church will be a gain for all parties concerned including Presbyterians.

"Methodism has always emphasized the value of a definite religious experience—the consciousness of the presence of God bringing a sense of pardoning love, of the peace that passeth understanding, and of the power that makes us strong to serve and sacrifice.

"Our attitude as a church is that religion is not primarily an intellectual process but an act of intelligent faith, whereby the whole personality of the man is brought into living contact and fellowship with the Father Spirit. . . .

"This emphasis of Methodism on personal experience as the test and touchstone of faith is in harmony with the psychology of the modern mind . . . the dictum of Benjamin Kidd in *The Science of Power* 'that the great secret of this age of the world is that civilization rests not on reason but on emotion, and that the emotion of the ideal is the supreme principle of efficiency in the collective struggle of the world;' these demand no revision of the Methodist theological positions but rather serve as pragmatic sanctions to the validity of Methodist teaching in making personal experience the foundation of a religious life.

"And growing out of this warm, rich, spiritual experience, there emerges the witnessing church against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. . . .

"And this emphasis on the value of a definite religious experience, the obligation and privilege of personal evangelism, the duty of a witnessing church to sound clearly the evangelistic note, which yet abide as distinctive features of Methodist teaching and life will make a real contribution to the church of a united Christendom. . . .

"The preaching of John Wesley brought the joy of forgiveness to thousands of penitent souls, and Charles Wesley put laughter on the lips of the masses of the United Kingdom as they sang, 'O for a thousand tongues to sing my great Redeemer's name.'

"And the people called Methodists have never quite lost the glow of the morning of their history and these hymn singing pilgrims of happy heart and radiant life will help the church of to-morrow to cast up a broad highway through no man's land, whereon the redeemed of the Lord shall return to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away. . . .

"But the social inadequacy of a purely individualistic gospel is becoming more and more apparent in the modern world. The church exists not only to save souls but to save lives, to give a deeper meaning to life, a richer content to personality.

"Whether it be the work of overthrowing buttressed wrong and organized vice which the church militant must undertake, or the deeper work of moulding a changing world after the social teachings of Jesus until we see the Holy City coming down from God to earth, Methodism with her spirit and traditions will help the reunited church to face the task and carry through the programme."*

It is also stated by Dr. Graham in the same article with reference to the contribution of Methodism to the thought and life of a re-united Christendom that:

"A great church, numbering its members by the millions, must permit a frank difference of opinion on many questions but demands loyalty to the essentials of Christian faith. Thus is given a unique value and significance to the few great fundamentals, that hold together in a corporate unity myriads of people, of variant types and conditions, in many lands, by a living faith that has become the master light of all their seeing mind and the motive spring of all their living."

Presbyterian Losses in Doctrine.

1. Possibly the great majority of Presbyterians, both unionists and non-unionists, who have given any serious study to the doctrine in the basis of union, are convinced that the adoption of these new twenty Articles of Faith will be a distinct loss to Presbyterianism. They were hastily formulated out of two ready-to-hand, modified and toned down Presbyterian documents, viz., the English and American Presbyterian Articles.† They are interspersed with dashes of Arminianism‡ which does not coalesce with Calvinism. Men feel that it is a great mistake to cast aside the great historic Westminster Standards,§ which have been a landmark in Christian systematic thinking, and which with their staunch, and even harsh doctrines, have produced a noble and rugged type of lofty

---

*Rev. J. H. Graham, D.D., Th. D. *Presbyterian Witness,* 1923.

†See Chapter III, A, and Addendum I, at close of book.

‡For these see Chapter III, E, 2, and Addendum I, at close of book.

§See Dr. McLeod's reply to Principal MacKinnon, Appendix XI, 6, (c).

spiritual character, second to none. To substitute a creed that has produced stability of religious conviction and vital Christianity for the poorly arranged, archaically worded and non-modern expression of something that does not express the living faith of intelligent people, is regarded as most unfortunate.

The late revered Principal Caven of Knox College, Toronto, paid this glowing tribute to the Westminster Confession of Faith, which is still the creed of the Presbyterian Church in Canada:

"In the Westminster Confession of Faith we have a most excellent system of Theology. Hardly any topic is wanting which would enter into a course of instruction, whether for the old or the young, whether for the ordinary learner or the scientific student. Compare with it the most elaborate of our great works on Systematic Theology, and you will find the substance of them all in this admirable compend. Look over the 'contents' of our Confession, beginning with the Chapter 'of the Holy Scriptures' and ending with the Chapter 'of the Last Judgment,' and tell us what is absent on which a parent would wish to instruct his children, a minister his people, or even a theological professor his students. And as the work is comprehensive, so its arrangement is good, and its definitions and statements remarkable for clearness and point. All this might indeed be expected, when we remember that for four years and a half so many of the most eminent divines of Great Britain, in a period singularly favoured with pious and eminent divines, were assiduously engaged in the preparation of our Standards."

Opposition to the basis of union comes from men of all shades of opinion.* The vast majority, however, who favour organic union refrain from public criticism of the basis, lest union be blocked, but they intend to fight for a revision or a new basis when the united church is formed. They forget, however, that such a change in the doctrine of the united church can only come by another act of Parliament. Many non-unionists deplore this submission of the present Free Church to the State.

Of those opposed to organic union and the doctrinal basis I shall single out two main classes the Liberalists and the Orthodox. A Liberalist writes:

"There are those—found chiefly among the ministers---who constitute what may be called for want of a better term the 'liberal element in the opposition.' They feel that the doctrinal burden of the proposed basis will be heavier than that of the Westminster Confession. They are quite content to give assent to the ancient creeds or the reformed Confession as symbols of the Catholic Faith as the banner about which the champions of truth and freedom rallied, so long as they are allowed liberty to interpret them in their historic setting; but they cannot work up any enthusiasm for a modern statement of Christian belief which is so largely an apparent compromise between systems that have had their day and ceased to be. Why suggest the old theological controversies for a working creed of life for to-day? Why not let Calvin and Arminius—to say nothing of Our First Parents—rest in peace? Or why be compromising on questions of scientific and historic study?

---

*See Chapter III. D.

"Should a pre-Christian Semitic poem of the origin of evil be set down in cold blood as binding on the Christian intellect in the twentieth century? Should the doctrine of the Fall of Man be put forth in a form that conflicts with the scientific theory of evolution? Is a child born with a sinful nature? If so, is it because of the sin of Adam and Eve? Are the Miraculous Conception and Virgin Birth of the essence of the Christian Faith? If they are lacking in our highest Christology, that of the fourth Gospel, are they necessary to a modern statement? Should not the church unequivocally allow reverent investigation of these high themes? Did Christ make satisfaction in the forensic sense for the sins of the world? Why not give a doctrine of atonement which preserves the scriptural and universally human principle of vicarious suffering and which will be intellible to those brought up in the atmosphere of evolutionary thought? A Canadian Professor of Theology was recently dismissed from his chair ostensibly on the ground that he was not loyal in his teaching to the letter of his church's creed. If there is a disposition to curtail liberty of interpreting ancient and reformed doctrines, shall we not be expected to give a rigid allegiance to the *ipssissima verba* of a modern statement? Such a statement, then, should be brief and fundamental, religious rather than theological and devoid of reference to matters of controversy. The proposed doctrinal basis appeals neither to the head nor to the heart of a large number of ministers and thoughtful laymen in the Presbyterian Church."*

Of the orthodox Presbyterians I shall give two main illustrations of their criticism of the content of the union doctrinal basis:

---

*Principal D. J. Fraser of Montreal, *Harvard Theol. Journal,* July 1915.

(*a*) "But to good Presbyterians," says the Rev. Dr. Campbell,* "the fault of the basis does not lie so much in what it embraces as in what it excludes.

"There is no mention made in it of the substance of eight of the articles of the 'Confession of Faith.' Not only are the matters of Chapters 3 and 7 to which reference has already been made, that is 'Of God's Eternal Decree,' and 'Of God's Covenant with Man' omitted; but also Chapter IX, 'Of Free Will;' Chapter XVII, 'Of the Perseverance of the Saints;' Chapter XXI, 'Of Religious Worship and the Sabbath Day;' Chapter XXII, 'Of Lawful Oaths;' Chapter XXIII, 'Of the Civil Magistrate;' Chapter XXIV, 'Of Marriage and Divorce,' which, with the Sabbath receives only passing mention; while the subject of Chapter X, 'Of Effectual Calling,' is only briefly alluded to under the Article VIII of the Basis. How the Presbyterian members of the Joint Committee could have agreed that these important matters should not have a recognized place in the teaching of the new Christian church, which they were about to start, passes comprehension, seeing how large a place some of these topics had in the past history of the Churches of Scotland. Nor are the questions of little importance in Canada. On the contrary some of them have live issues here."†

(*b*) A voice from the West:

"As I do not know of any doctrinal gains I will briefly refer to the losses.

(1) "It is admitted that the professed doctrinal basis is a compromise, and we have no right to compromise *essential* truth in doctrine or in morals.

(2) "Calvinism and Arminianism are theological as well as logical contradictions, the one logically leads to salvation by sovereign grace, and the other to salvation by works. The Roman church is the only *consistent* Arminian body in the world, unless it be the Greek church.

(3) "It has been stated that no element of any creed is essential except what *practically* determines our relation to God through Christ. Hodge says that: 'In the theology of the *heart* all regenerated souls are Calvanists, that is, all Christians ascribe their salvation to God only.' This is practically proved by the fact that it is the only theology that can be *prayed* and *sung*, or used in worship. The great prayers and hymns of the church universal prove this beyond a doubt.

(4) "The standard historians admit that the most moral people in the world have been Calvinists. It is the doctrine that led to liberty and education, and that inspired the great martyrs

---

*The late distinguished scholar, and ex-clerk of the General Assembly.

†*Relation of the Christian Churches* (Wm. Briggs, Toronto).

and missionaries. Froude tells us that the Reformation would have been crushed were it not for the Calvinists.

(5) "The proposed union in Canada tends to surrender essentials for non-essentials, and quality for quantity in the church of Christ. The essential signs, or marks, of the church are: apostolicity, catholicity, sanctity, and unity. Organization is not essential to the unity of the church any more than it is to the unity of the *human family* to be in *one nation.* If truth is sacrificed for the sake of *organic* union we are liable to lose both the truth and the unity. The greatest opponents of *real* Christian unity are those who insist so strongly on *organic* union, as, for example, the Roman Catholic Church. Division of the organism has accomplished more for the spiritual life of the church than any organic union as, for example, the Reformation of the 16th Century; and the secessions that have taken place during the past 200 years in Scotland, England and other countries. Two hundred men united on the truth are stronger than two hundred million united on error.

(6) "The proposed union in Canada means a *creedless church,* for the ministers are not bound to subscribe to the doctrinal statement.

(7) "It appears, therefore, that as Presbyterians we are surrendering all the vital doctrines for which our forefathers fought and died.

"Please understand that this brief and inadequate statement refers only to the *doctrinal* Basis. The creed of Calvinism is more essential than Presbyterianism, but all loyal sons of the church accept both."*

No Definite Subscription.

The question of credal subscription has been discussed in Chapter III, C, and in a quotation in this section. It is, however, important to note the words of a leading opponent of organic union, e.g. "The claim that there is subscription is a sample of the duplicity lying behind the whole union movement. The fact is there is no subscription to the doctrines of the united church at ordination, but there is an indefinite examination test previously, before a transitory committee of the church, not before a permanent court of the church. The subscription is really to Scripture, and we know that a Unitarian could subscribe to that, as the essential spirit of apostolic and post-apostolic times. (For example I and II Tim. and Titus). But then he could proceed to say Greek thought and beliefs have coloured and changed all this, hence he would refuse definite subscription to historic credal doctrines."*

---

*Letter to me from the Rev. Chas. MacKay, Delburne, Alberta.

Definite Belief and Character Building.

Non-unionists argue that definiteness of belief has immediate effect on character. Character has been fundamentally influenced by the strong and definite standards of Presbyterian doctrine; whereas to substitute these by the new basis of union which is distinctly indefinite both in content of doctrine and in subscription thereto, is a tremendous loss. They claim that it is the actual teaching and not the general opinions of men that makes for character;† and that, therefore, the criticism and abandonment of the Westminster Standards is not only superficial but wholly unwarrantable, unless those who advocate such a change can come forward with a new, definite and believable basis of doctrine. This has not been done.

Catechisms Cast Aside.

They further assert that while the Larger Catechism has not been used to any extent, the Shorter Catechism has. In fact the Shorter Catechism, which organic union will cast aside, has been the training ground of the Church, and is still used in many quarters with wholesome and permanent effect on character building. Many non-organic-unionists maintain that the Shorter Catechism, as a popular manual of divinity, has never been equalled. Dr. Thomas Chalmers used to commend it as the best compendium of the Christian religion extant. They regret that any union movement should deal so superficially with this standard of Faith, as well as with the great Confession of Faith which has given to Presbyterianism a treasure house of spiritual truth, and sentences unrivalled for brevity and sublimity. It is maintained, that although these standards need revision, they still, when reverently and deeply studied, possess much of their ancient power. With reference to the five distinctive points of Calvinism, e.g.—(1) Unconditional predestination, (2) Total depravity, (3) A particular and definite atonement, (4) Effectual calling, (5)

---

*Private Interview.

†Cf. Rom. Catholic Church.

The final perseverance of the saints—certain orthodox non-unionists say that number (2) is retained but interpreted with archaic literalness; number (3) is practically universalized; numbers (1), (4), and (5) receive slim reference because the spirit of them is superficially conceived of, or not understood at all. All these tonings down, it is argued, were concessions to Methodist Arminianism which when thus attempted by parallelism and freak phraseology does not work out in any logical or effective way.* Therefore, it is claimed, the standards of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, are departed from here and elsewhere as indicated in various parts of our discussion, without giving a satisfactory substitute, in the form of a fresh and modern statement, for doctrines that have had far reaching effect, in days gone by.

The Preamble to the Twenty Articles of Union Criticized:

Studious non-organic-unionists point out that this Preamble is not what it is professed to be. It is of no more scientific value so far as the union proposal is concerned than the introduction to the polity. It has no theological value, but it has the same purpose as the introduction to the polity in the basis, namely, to help to facilitate and expedite the consummation of organic union by Act of Parliament. It is a superficial attempt to carry the whole creeds of the negotiating churches into the basis of union, by glittering generalities which do not hold for, at least, these reasons:

(1) If it does what it pretends to do, at best by subtle implication; then why draw up the twenty Articles of Union?†

(2) These mollified, incoherent, and inert Articles contradict the preamble.

(3) The fact of no definite credal subscription at Presbyterian ordination is inconsistent with a literal interpretation of the preamble.

(4) "If the Preamble is to be taken literally, (and it must be taken literally, as well as the twenty Articles, if the church yields to Parliament the right to fix her doctrines by an Act of Parliament, such as is now proposed, with the Basis

---

*Gist of private interview with scholarly opponent of organic union.

†See Rev. Dr. McLeod's booklet referred to in Appendix XI, 6, (c).

of Union as an integral part of same) then we shall suffer a tremendous loss which logically follows from a false statement of doctrine in the Preamble, that is an example of incompetency in the matter of doctrinal formulation, namely,—'We affirm our belief in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the primary source and ultimate standards of Christian faith and life.' This is utterly incorrect, because the primary source of Christian faith and life is not Scripture but the Spirit of God. 'We are begotten of the Spirit', and this no branch of the Church would deny.

"It is also of vital importance to note here that this incorrect assertion disproves the claim of the Preamble that it sets forth our common faith. Moreover since we are here considering Presbyterian losses in union doctrine, it is equally important to note that the Westminster Standards (Chapter I) do not teach the conception of Scripture as set forth in the doctrinal Preamble in the basis of union."*

No Organic Union of Doctrine in the Basis.

Many other criticisms of the basis might be mentioned, such as are found in Chapter III, Sections A, B, C, D, and in the Addendum to this book; but to cite them would be mere repetition. I shall, therefore, close this portion of our discussion by bringing into clear light an important doctrinal implication from the foregoing treatment of the subject under review. It is that obviously there is no organic union of doctrine, and hence the scheme of organic union breaks down at this point also. In view of this I beg again to submit that this is another piece of evidence in favour of the federal scheme of union which I am advocating throughout this study.†

II. PRESBYTERIAN EMPHASIS IN POLITY, IN CANADA.

This is the second main heading in our discussion of Canadian Presbyterianism. In introducing this study of Presbyterian polity I cannot do better than to quote from an excellent article by the Reverend Professor J. W. Falconer,

---

*Gist of an interview with the Rev. T. Wardlaw Taylor, Ph. D. Compare also Westminster Confession, Chapter II.

†See especially Chapters III, D; IV, (21); and VII.

D.D.* In his treatment of "The Contribution of the Presbyterian Church to a Re-united Christendom" he gives the following carefully prepared statement of Presbyterian Polity:

"While each denomination shares in the common traditions and doctrines of the universal or catholic church yet each also has special features of its own, and Presbyterianism is distinguished by its polity or form of government which is representative as opposed to monarchical. The aim kept in view is to afford the largest possible scope, by the forms of ministry and the courts of government, for the expression of the christian convictions of the whole membership. This results from the belief that the church consists in the unity of the believers and not in the council of the officials, and that this is in complete accord with the New Testament ideal which presents the church as a self-governing community having the right to elect officers and to pass judgment on the great issues that may emerge.

"This representative feature is apparent in three directions: (1) Each congregation has the right to elect its own elders or presbyters, as in the earliest days, whose duty it is to decide on the spiritual problems of each community in the name of the congregation. These elders as the spokesmen of the people have proved to be a great bulwark of the Faith, and many devoted and influential Christians have filled this office to the great advantage of the cause of Christ, and have been a safeguard against the undue assumption of authority which is a possible menace in a monarchical system. (2) The minister as the presiding officer is set apart for the special task of caring for the spiritual wants of the congregation. He is to break the bread of life, to administer the sacraments and to direct the healing and helping activities of the church. But his ordination does not confer on him any unique priestly office that would be inconsistent with the priesthood of all believers, while it is especially to be noted that there is a complete parity among the ministers. It is true that there is a preeminence which ability, special training or devoted service will bring, but it is the preeminence which is to be found in democracies not that of an aristocracy. In the final test when things are brought to a vote the voice of one is of equal value with that of another. This parity of the ministry is a much cherished feature in Presbyterianism. (3) The Courts of the Church are especially adapted for the expression of the will of the people. Every member can appeal to the Session of his congregation, and if he desires can carry his case to the Presbytery, Synod and Assembly in all of which there is an equal number of ministers and elders.

---

*Of the Presbyterian College, Halifax, Canada, (*Presbyterian Witness,* 1923).

"It has never been part of our tradition to advocate a complete submission of the individual to the governing leaders of the church, the hierarchy. We believe that there is in the enlightened Christian consciousness of the members, a power of understanding and appreciation of the truth of God and a sense of righteousness, that decides ultimately the great moral issue, all being under the direction of the Spirit of Christ promised to every believer. The system is thus the logical issue of the Presbyterian doctrine of the church as a fellowship of all believers not a federation of officials, and it is difficult to imagine a more workable system by which a community can guide itself. History seems to confirm this. Professor Heron writes: 'It is a simple historical fact of deep significance that whereon the Reformation had free course, wherever it was permitted to shape itself spontaneously after Scripture and without external interference, it assumed a Presbyterian form.' The records of modern missionary enterprise may also be appealed to for evidence of the continual vitality of this form of rule. This polity is in keeping with the spirit of the age. We therefore hope that any new expansion or union will retain this representative ideal which is found in the New Testament and which has helped to develop a love for freedom and a resourcefulness which are so necessary for strength of character."

Canadian Presbyterianism Stresses Liberty of Conscience.

The general statement of Presbyterian polity which I have quoted, is applicable to the polity of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, because the government of this church is "in accordance with the recognized principles and practice of Presbyterian Churches, as laid down generally in the "Form of Presbyterian Church Government."* While Canadian Presbyterianism shares in this world-wide Presbyterian polity, I believe that in Canada the emphasis on polity is more at one with the polity of American Presbyterianism than with that of the Church of Scotland, in one particular point. That is, that it is further removed from the possibility of diocesan episcopacy than the Scottish Church and like the American Church lays greater stress on liberty of conscience—that liberty of conscience whereby Christ has made his people free. At the forefront of American Presbyterian polity stands the great motto, 'God alone is Lord of the Conscience'.† In this lofty and liberty-loving ideal Canadians most heartily share.

**Rules and Forms of Procedure Pres. Church in Canada,* p. 69.

†*American Form of Presbyterian Government,* Chapter I, 1.

Presbyterian Polity Arose Out of Doctrine, and is Rooted in Calvinism.

I wish at this point to dispel two false notions and to draw a logical deduction therefrom. Both notions are the outcome of loose thinking and have within them the seeds of misunderstanding which if they take root in Canadian Presbyterianism may grow up as weeds and choke great principles for which pure Presbyterianism has historically stood. The first incorrect conception is that Presbyterianism is purely a system of government unrelated to doctrine. The second notion is that organic union is a practical affair and has nothing to do with doctrine, and therefore is not an academic question at all.

In regard to the first error, of which I shall have more to say presently, I would now refer the reader to Professor Dall's definition of Presbyterianism given at the very beginning of this section (Chapter III, E III), where he says, in effect, that Presbyterianism involves a distinctive type of doctrine. In this view I heartily concur.

Of the second erroneous notion that organic union can take place apart from doctrine, I wish categorically to state that such is not possible, because, as we shall presently see, Presbyterian polity is the outflow of certain doctrines stressed by John Calvin. Moreover if there is then to be no organic union of doctrine and its resultant polity, the so-called organic union movement must obviously be falsely named. And my deduction is one which I have elsewhere made (Chapter IV, 21) that if such is the fact, the said movement is confined to one of common motives and work shared with the negotiating churches; and it follows from this that federal union or its equivalent is the solution of our problem and not organic union. This I have also dwelt upon in the closing chapter of this book. But I now go further and say that since polity is rooted in doctrine then the question of organic union becomes academic, and to ignore this fact will lead us away from fundamental principles of Presbyterianism that cannot be salvaged by an Act of Parliament, however much that Act, if passed, may declare that the three churches are now merged into one carrying all their historic and essential principles with them.

The real fact would be that these principles have been ignored.

How Comes it that Polity is Rooted in Doctrine?

It was somewhat in this manner. John Calvin* had a two-fold fundamental message for his king, namely: (1) He wanted to show the King how the Church stood in relation to the historic creeds, rather than to dwell upon the corruption of the Roman Church. This fundamental fact is too often overlooked. (2) The immortal doctrine of the Sovereignty of God was held up by Calvin before the king as the one great hope, at a time when growing anarchy was fighting against all authorities in Europe. There naturally followed from this the arresting fact that kings were on equal footing with the humblest citizen under the Headship and authority of Christ, before the Divine throne, and the common man, therefore, must needs be given the precious gift of liberty of conscience. Thus it was that in Calvinism and Presbyterianism rooted in Calvinism, as we shall see, there were embodied great principles which have made Presbyterianism, neither an autocracy nor a democracy, but the mother of modern democracy in a high and well-regulated sense under the Headship of Christ. "By her standards and practice she is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. To many nowadays this seems little more than a pious phrase. To the Reformers it was the expression of a most tremendous truth. As such it was wrought into the very warp and woof of the theory and polity of the church. Apart from it that polity cannot be understood. It defines and limits everything."†

All this was carried over into Scottish Presbyterianism in matters of polity, which the Canadian Presbyterian Church as a daughter of the Church of Scotland now shares. If anyone doubts this important statement, all that is necessary to prove its validity is a study of the documents of the Continental and Scottish Reformation.‡

---

*Calvin's Institutes.

†Rev. T. Wardlaw Taylor, M.A., Ph.D. (*Pres. Witness,* March 29, 1923). Dr. Taylor is one of the leading Canadian authorities on Presbyterian Polity.

‡See *Documents of The Continental Reformation,* p. 686 ff, Kidd (Clarendon Press, Oxford).

What then are the pure Principles of Presbyterian Polity Shared by Canadians?

They may be classified as three fundamentals:

(1) *The Unity of the Church.*

This does not mean organic union with other churches, but the spiritual and organic unity within the church as over against uncontrolled individualistic movements. The idea was and is that of the church standing for authority as against rash or anarchic democracy.

(2) *The Liberty of Conscience.*

The authority of the church was not to interfere with liberty of conscience, since before the Divine throne the King and the humblest citizen were equal under the Headship of Christ. This involves a fundamental principle of Presbyterianism world-wide and in Canada, namely, that Presbyterians hold that God alone is the Lord of Conscience, and that they are the judges on that plan of what they shall do. This accounts for the many divisions of Scottish Christianity. It does not mean that Scottish folk are a quarrelsome people, but it does mean that they stand out for the fundamental spiritual (and doctrinal, if you will) right to judge in matters of conscience. This fact also substantially accounts for the opposition to organic union in Canada to-day, on the part of thousands of Canadians who have taken to their hearts this great principle. In very truth this is a matter of soul-fervour with these non-unionists.*

(3) *All Administration in the pure Presbyterian Church is a spiritual function.*

That is men are called and set apart by ordination for every function. From the plate collector to the minister, all are called to perform spiritual functions. In Canada and elsewhere, in so far as managers have taken the place of deacons, and are considered to be looking after the secular affairs of the church, to that extent there is a departure from

---

*Passionate expression to this principle has been set forth by Professor Cyrus MacMillan of McGill Univ., Montreal, in an article entitled "The Mediaevalism of Church Union," (*Presbyterian Witness,* April 5, 1923).

pure Presbyterianism, to which all functions are sacred and of Christ.*

Church Government in The Basis of Union.

As I have devoted a chapter to the polity in the basis of union (Chapter V), I shall endeavour, in this section, to keep to our text of Gains and Losses, and refrain from detailed discussion, which the reader may find in the aforesaid chapter.

Presbyterian Gains in Polity in the Union Proposal.

The gains in polity, claimed by unionists, may have a greater bearing upon the outlook for church union than the gains, claimed by them, in matters of doctrine. The present age does not boast of many martyrs for whom the pure doctrines are the very essence of life. Monetary and efficiency advantages through unified administration may be secured. Church union, it is argued, would mean the manning of fields at less expense. Overlapping might be avoided to a large extent, and a much better use made of home missionaries in thinly populated districts. The same results are hoped for in all departments of administration where co-operation is now practised.

With regard to the attempt to solve the difficult problem of the settlement of the minister, unionists declare that the basis of union preserves the rights of the people to call, and yet seeks to pave the way for a rapid settlement and separation, when deemed desirable by either minister or people. It is the most difficult problem in the Presbyterian system, and this attempted solution may not prove final, but it is an attempt to bring relief where pressure is greatest. Many ministers, it is believed, favour union on this account.

Moreover, the question of a time limit in connection with the pastorate would naturally tend to the settlement of mature men in churches for a term of years. These men are sometimes passed by under our present system. Congregations do not care to call men who are much past middle life. In addition, the matter of appointment without call is possible in

---

**2nd Book of Discipline,* Chapter VIII.

union. To a certain extent it could be accepted without much opposition.

The election of office-bearers for a term of years, instead of for life or good conduct, might rid the church of men who are sometimes a hindrance to progress. A good deal can be said in favour of such a change.

Of course one cannot really say what gains may accrue, if any, from the union polity because it remains to be found out by experience if the mixed denominational scheme will work, what changes may be necessary to improve it; and what results may come from its operation.*

Presbyterian Losses in Polity in The Union Proposal.

The central and great loss in union polity is:

1. *Presbyterian administration which is all a spiritual function is to be replaced by what may be called a secular administration.*†

This is claimed to be a blow at the heart of pure Presbyterianism, and an undesirable and dangerous lowering of the lofty conception of the spiritual government of the church. Pure Presbyterianism regards all administration from top to bottom or vice versa as a spiritual service for the Lord. Those joined in this from the congregation, up through all the courts to the General Assembly, are conceived of as being called of Christ and set apart to perform spiritual functions in His service. By the polity in the basis of union, they will act simply because they are elected by the people. This means an unfortunate secularization of an essential spiritual ideal or doctrine of Presbyterianism, that has worked effectively in giving depth, dignity, respect and reverence, both to the one divinely called and to the sacred office to which he is called. Let us note some of the ramifications or losses involved in this lowering of the spiritual ideal:

(1) *The Elder and the Eldership will mean less in the United Church.*

In passing let me remind the reader that I have taken the liberty of naming such an one an elder, although I have no authority for applying that honoured and historic name to "the member of session who may be called an Elder", since the basis of union does not use the term, nor does it specify who is eligible for the office. In fact women are not debarred by its wording. But the point to be emphasized is that according to the essential principle of Presbyterianism "Eldership is a spiritual function as is the ministry."* In the proposed new "Session" of the basis of union, there is no mention of ordination; no provision for it; the office of ruling elder has no place. He is simply chosen as a member of any Committee might be chosen for a longer or shorter time, under rules yet to be framed by the proposed church.† . This is an example of the government in the basis, which is to be exercised throughout, in a secular manner, and not by officers called and ordained to spiritual functions.

---

*See Chapter V, C, for Diversity of views as to the Polity in the basis of union.

†Dr. T. Wardlaw Taylor (Interview).

Moreover, "to give up to any extent the democratic government involved in the status of the elders as a governing body, would involve the freedom we enjoy from dominant clericalism."‡ Again the time limit in the service of the eldership may tend to hinder devotion and lessen the influence which comes from a call to life service.

(2) *The Quarterly or Official Board of the Methodist Church is a cumbersome and unnecessary piece of machinery introduced into the united church.*§

But a greater loss is that the lofty ideal of spiritual office is again lowered; because those who go into this Board include not only members of Session but also stewards (or managers), who may not even be members of the church. This is a secularization of administration.

(3) *The new type of Presbytery will suffer this secular encroachment.*

To sit in Presbytery has always been an honoured spiritual function. But by the basis of union, the quarterly board,

---

***2nd Book of Discipline,* Chapter VI.

†See Polity II, B, 13 and 14 (Appendix V), See also my chapter V, E, 3, for detailed discussion on "The Elder's Farewell".

‡Rev. Geo. P. Duncan, (Letter).

§Appendix V, Basis II, B, 13.

some of whose members may not even be church members, are to select lay representation to Presbytery; and while, these representatives no longer appointed by the Session, must be members of the church, they need not be elders ordained to spiritual office.* Moreover the method of choosing lay members to Presbytery is left unsettled.† Again Presbytery can elect any church members to conference who are not members of Presbytery. All this secularization is contrary to Presbyterianism.

The basis of union apparently takes from Presbytery its right of discipline relative to the ministry, and transfers it to the conference. This is a concession to Methodist Polity.‡ True Presbyterianism claims spiritual succession for her ministry as real as in the Anglican or Roman Catholic Church; for the power of ordination rests with a group of Presbytery "orderly constituted." This is sacrificed in the basis of union, and it overlooks the hiatus of reordination. If there is no mutual recognition of Holy Orders there can be no wider union which may include Anglicans.

"The final right of ordination and settlement of the ministers rests with the conference and its 'Settlement Committee'. It does not rest with the Presbytery as now. The Settlement Committee is placed over the Presbytery. Against this (Methodist) committee there is no appeal. The very basis of our Presbyterian system is taken away."§

(4) *The Settlement Committee is a further illustration of secularized administration.*

The Presbyterian Church has stood for a ministry as a direct gift of the Lord to His people, in which no one has a right to meddle. The Presbytery can only judge as to the sufficiency of the call as from God or not. But the Settlement Committee in the basis of union is governed by the wishes of the individual (minister and people), and the convenience of the church at large. When you contrast these conceptions, you find the new scheme is a distinct lowering of the spiritual

---

*Appendix V, Basis II, B, 17, (2).
†Ibid, 19, (2).
‡*Methodist Discipline,* pp. 149 ff.
§Dr. McLeod, Appendix XI, 6, (c).

conception of the Lord calling a minister through His people. This lofty ideal means submission to Divine judgment; whereas the union ideal is submission to a committee, who are the sole judges and from whom there is no appeal. They can settle ministers as they please. The practice of the Methodist Church has often proven this, despite the wishes of the people. Again by the basis of union "when a minister chosen by a pastoral charge cannot be settled, the charge or its constitutional representatives may place other names before the Settlement Committee."* That is, two representatives can make choice of a minister for the congregation, from the ministers named by the Settlement Committee when the Committee states the man "called" cannot be sent. That is a far cry from Presbyterian inbred democratic tendencies.

It should not be forgotten, non-unionists argue, that experience has shown that around such committees, having to do with the distribution of patronage, there are always undue influences caballing personal preferences as over against the spiritual call of God to the ministry through the people. It is true too that a committee's responsibility is not like that of an individual. It can shift the blame. The one appealing cannot lay the responsibility on anyone, as in the case of the Anglican Bishopric. The latter is a superior system to the Methodist Settlement Committee. Much of the unrest in the Presbyterian system of settling the minister is undoubtedly due to a growing laxity on the part of Presbytery to discharge its function of ruling. To-day there is too much weak acquiescence.

2. *The Union Polity is a retrograde movement to clerical authority.*

Non-organic-unionists claim that not only will the new administration be secular, but that "the 'passing of the Presbytery' would also mean the passing in a large measure, of the people's rights by the centralizing of control, which is a going back to clerical authority instead of forward to popular liberty and responsibility."† One illustration must suffice. At present the Presbyteries choose their commissioners to the Assembly annually and chiefly by rotation. Each one has his opportunity. In the proposed basis this right will be transferred to the Conference (Synod). Rotation would be impracticable. The less prominent would seldom see the Assembly, or enjoy its benefits. All the more is this true, when it is noted that the General Council (Assembly) is to meet every second year, and its membership to be cut down very greatly.

---

*Appendix V, The Ministry, II, B, (7).

†This point is elaborated in Chapter V, "The New Presbytery in the Basis of Union."

Many points in the basis are set forth in "Anti-Union" literature to prove that the union polity means "at least delegated, not representative democracy."

3. *An incorporated church will tend to autocracy.*

It is asserted that, the Presbyterian Church is not incorporated, and is more given to checking and questioning executive control, than an incorporated church would be.

4. *The Polity is more Methodist than Presbyterian.*

Non-unionists maintain that a careful analysis of the basis shows that "the present Methodist polity is practically unchanged but with a few good Presbyterian terms attached to some parts of the machinery."

5. *The questions asked at ordination ignore the church.*

In the Presbyterian Church elders and ministers at their ordination are asked to profess their belief in the polity of the church, as a matter of conscience and principle. They profess belief in that the government of this church by Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies is founded on and agreeable to the word of God, and they pledge themselves to maintain and defend the same. In the basis of union no such profession of belief is called for, and no such pledge is given.* "These ordination questions entirely go back on the Presbyterian loyalty to the church and its courts, as well as to its doctrine."†

6. *Too many points are left to be settled by the united church.*

For example: (1) No acturarial statistics have as yet been made of the value of church property, assets, etc., with a

---

*Compare *Rules and Forms of Procedure,* pp. 79 & 81, with Basis of Union (Appendix V, The Ministry, III).

†Presbyterian Professor and Unionist. (Interview).

view to union. (2) How is the Session to be constituted? (3) What is to be the relation of the Presbytery to the Settlement Committee? (4) The working out of the practicability of the combination of the Methodist itinerant system of the pastorate and the unlimited ministry of the Presbyterians, has been left in abeyance. If these systems will not merge, it ought to be found out or proven before union. (5) A definite plan for the support of aged and infirm ministers, widows, and orphans, and the administration of other benevolent funds is waived pending union. (6) Who are to be the heads of departments in the new united church? This is not yet determined. Is the office of General Superintendent of the Methodist Church to be done away with? If there is to be a chief executive officer, from what denomination will he be chosen and what powers will he have? (7) What about the colleges? To economize, are certain Presbyterian colleges to be closed? If so, which colleges? What other schemes of economy in general administration are planned?

III. Presbyterian Emphasis on Other Points, In Canada.

(1) *Education*:

"The Presbyterian Church has laid great stress on the teaching office and has exalted the sermon as a great source of instruction and inspiration. It has urged the minister to regard the pulpit as his throne. The Church is in possession of a body of divinely inspired truth which is necessary for the salvation of the individual and for the well-being of society. This is enshrined in the Scriptures and in the extensive literature of Christendom and it is the task of the church to preserve the message in its pure state, to retain all its essentials, and so to study the temper and spirit of our own age as to make the message of Christ effective over the lives of the people. Faithful and persistent presentation of the essentials of the Gospel from the pulpit has been of the highest value in awakening the conscience of the indifferent, in calling forth the enthusiasm of the young, in correcting abuses in private and public life, in comforting the weak and sorrowful and in filling the mind with the noble hopes of the Saviour.

"But this task requires a long course of spiritual and literary preparation. Only a trained mind is equal to the demands of this high vocation. At times the wisdom of a long and severe discipline for entrance upon the ministry has been questioned, and some have advocated shorter courses of study. Such a procedure would inevitably result in an impoverished congregational life and an enfeebled christian experience. This emphasis which Presbyterians have laid upon an educated ministry is one of the traditions which we would not willingly neglect and we would deprecate any movement that tends to slacken the mental and spiritual strife of those who aspire after the high office of guiding people into the mysteries of the devout life. A well-furnished mind in a preacher is one of the best defences against the presentation of immature and partial views of the great body of christian truth."*

It is worthy of note, however, that while Methodist standards of education have been gradually raised, the Presbyterians have been letting down the bars too freely in order to receive ministerial applicants from other communions, whose training has not been so thorough. Semi-educated evangelicals from other lands have also been employed especially in pioneer work. All this was due to shortage of men for the ministry, which has now been largely overcome by co-operation with other denominations. It is to be hoped that this laxity will cease. It is considered unfortunate, by many, and especially by non-unionists, that even the Presbyterian ministry is showing a weakness in doctrinal preaching and teaching. The popular appeal is too readily replacing sound exegetical and vital exposition. It is claimed that this accounts for many ministers being organic unionists, nine-tenths of whom accept the feeble doctrinal basis of union, without a knowledge of its spiritual implications, or of the goal to which such a 'watery theology' will lead them and their people.

Moreover the united church makes place for local preachers.† This is regarded by non-unionists as a distinct lowering of the Presbyterian standards of the ministry. It is also regarded as another secular contribution, whereas pure Presbyterians believe that education is essential to the spiritual function of the Lord in the preaching of His ministers. More than the A, B, C, of the gospel is necessary. Lay preaching tends inevitably to the undesirable and harmful introduction of fervent rhapsody rather than instructional Christianity.

The plan of studies required of the candidates for the

---

*Professor J. W. Falconer, D.D., (*Presbyterian Witness,* 1923).
†Appendix V, (III, 20, (4)).

ministry in the basis is purely tentative. It is suggested, not fixed. The whole educational policy of the "United Church", like many another important matter, is held in abeyance until union is consummated. Non-organic unionists claim this is another proof that organic union is an obsession not a reasonable proposition.

These statements are the gist of correspondence, interviews and research. My own view is that one cannot dogmatize, but I have a strong feeling that the ministry of the respective churches will be more fruitful in spiritual blessings, if they remain within their special and peculiar spheres of activity; while at the same time marching side by side in common tasks. This can be accomplished best by federal union.

(2) *Worship.*

(*a*) *The sacraments.*

"The Presbyterian Church accepts the two sacraments as holy ordinances wherein by outward symbols Christ is held forth and appropriated by all that believe. In the case of the Lord's Supper celebration is less frequent than in other churches and the manner of giving the elements is also different. The ideal aimed at is to have all the members of the congregation meet together at each communion service; and much attention is paid, when the best Scotch traditions are followed, to the impressive and solemn preparation for their periodic festivals. They have been made landmarks in the journey of Christians towards a higher life, and have often proved to be revival services in which the personal claims of the Gospel have been brought home to the heart. Their quarterly celebrations with their deep religious associations have often been the means of impressing the careless, and of calling out the deepest longings of the soul. Dr. Kelman thus describes the observance of the Lord's Supper in St. Georges, Edinburgh: 'They were genuine banquets of the spirit; symposia where men ate and drank at the table of God, places for conversation between the soul and Christ.' It is to be hoped that no absorption in the things of sense and no pressure of social tasks will ever cause our church to lessen its hold upon the sacraments, which stand for the mystical and supernatural aspect of the Religion of Christ."*

Unionists claim Presbyterians will gain by organic union in that it will remove the barriers that separate them from their brethren in Christ. They think this closer fellowship at

---

*Professor J. W. Falconer, D.D., (*Presbyterian Witness*, 1923).

the Lord's Table will be good for their souls. The hard-headed non-organic Presbyterians have their doubts about this, and feel that it is best to leave well enough alone. They are not quite ready for the mingling of the Methodist love-feast flavour and fervor, with the more serious solemnity of the Presbyterian sacraments. This mixture tends to the dilution of spiritual sentiment and value for both denominations. Again, many including at least a few thoughtful unionists, realize the superficial treatment of the sacraments in the basis of union. They are inadequately defined.

(*b*) *General effect of union on type of worship.*

Prominent leaders have told me the mingling of the two types will be a jump in the dark. No one can tell how the mixture will blend. There can be no doubt that while the denominations are growing more and more alike through fellowship, education, proximity, intermarriage and the like, there is still a difference of atmosphere. The growing similarity in tone and method of worship is possibly more marked in the large city churches. But non-organic unionists claim that it is not sufficiently advanced to warrant organic union, at the expense of making people uneasy in the church home of their choice. They point to the different new denominational hymnals as one proof of this. The Methodist hymnal is characterized by the large addition of fervent, joy-ringing Wesleyan hymns, whilst the new Presbyterian hymnal has a large increase in the number of the staid and lofty Psalms. It is further noted that these denominations have had different conceptions of worship with corresponding difference of atmosphere, as seen not only in the preaching and singing, but also in prayer, and in the way in which strangers are welcomed. The Presbyterian worship has an atmosphere about it, which has been created by a long process through the centuries as part of the great catholic church, and taken up and modified by John Knox and his followers. It calls for a simple, reverent, dignified form. More and more nowadays this is being demanded, and in calling for a better and more satisfying type of service, the pre-reformation taste for the aesthetic in worship is being asked for, but almost always on condition that it be restrained by the limits of simplicity. A very small number would like a reversion to the Gregorian chants of the Roman Church.

This tendency to satisfy the aesthetic is creeping into the Methodist Church also, especially in the larger cities. There still is, however, more of the light, familiar, and buoyant tone to the Methodist worship; and considerably more of the element of entertainment and warm handshaking with a view to drawing people to the Methodist Church. The influence of Methodism as a group of societies and not as a branch of the historic catholic church no doubt somewhat accounts for these differences.

The reader will understand, I hope, that these varied views which I have gathered and unfolded, do not arise, (as is commonly but erroneously supposed), from any feeling of superiority or bitterness on the part of the respective denominations but rather is it merely a statement of psychological facts. These facts deserve very serious attention in any study of union. They will have more far-reaching effect in the case of organic union than in that of federation. Federation would avoid the risk of the possible non-blending of these types with its resultant dilution of spirituality in the church and the kingdom of God in Canada.

The man who says "full steam ahead" is the man who does not think. He is by that disqualified for leadership, and is in the last analysis a reactionary. The denominations must guard against this kind of blind and obsessed advocacy of a scheme not thought through to its logical conclusions.

(*c*) *Ordination questions and worship.*

Those opposed to union who have studied the basis, point out that the basis of union also goes back on Presbyterian standards of worship. No vow is called for at ordination to own "the purity of worship at present authorized by the Presbyterian Church in Canada." "The Directory for the Public Worship of God" is part of our Church law. The basis ignores this, and hence Presbyterians claim this is a great loss.

(3) MISCELLANEOUS PRESBYTERIAN LOSSES IN UNION PROPOSAL.

(1) *Thousands of Presbyterians deplore the inevitable disruption that will follow the enforcement of Organic Union.*

(*a*) One of the great principles of Presbyterianism is the principle of the unity of the church, as we have seen in our discussion of her polity. Now organic union in Canada, is pointed to as an instrument of disunion, not only by anti-unionists but by thoughtful and sane unionists. It will mean a split in the Presbyterian Church, the extent of which no one can determine. Presbyterians will not be driven in matters of liberty of conscience, which is a second great principle of Presbyterianism, as we have noted. Disruption is at variance with the motive of spiritual union, not to mention organic union. The present union proposal has narrowed down to a mere union of a split Presbyterian Church with Methodists and a few thousand Congregationalists. This kind of union is, therefore, undesirable and dangerous, and is a definite loss in that it merely creates another circumscribed denomination, based on narrow principles and hasty action, that will result in warfare, division, bitterness, and a big legal battle over church properties, trust funds, and all other assets to which "loyal Presbyterians" will lay claim.

These are some of the stock arguments of non-organic unionists, who further claim that there is not a thing necessary to the spiritual progress of Canadian Christianity that cannot be accomplished as well and more widely by statesmanlike co-operation or federation.

(*b*) *Dr. Drummond's Remedy Through Federation.*

Federal union as a 'way out' of the organic union impasse is shared by a number of prominent unionists, who are now actually forming a third party in the Presbyterian Church, headed by one of their ablest and sanest leaders, the Rev. D. R. Drummond, D.D., of Hamilton. As a solution of the church union crisis Dr. Drummond presents a concrete plan of federation. "It has moderation, but it has also movement, and movement forward, and it leaves something to the future. It is offered as a fresh starting point, as a means of securing what the great mass of our people and of the religious public of Canada desire—peace and goodwill within the Presbyterian Household of Faith and within a much wider fellowship." These are Dr. Drummond's own words. He further states that while his plan is only in its initial stages and may be improved, yet he believes that it can be worked out adequately as a solution for our day of the problem that presses on us.

This plan of federal union, in the judgment of the writer is as the sun of hope bursting through the dark clouds of strife, —clouds that for years have been hiding the face of God from the church. While I do not accept some points in Dr. Drummond's scheme of union, I believe that he himself is sincere, and that his plan is worth serious consideration. His plan, I understand, as the result of a personal interview with him, is an attempt to meet conditions as they are, and not as the opposing parties on union would like to have them. It recognizes the important fact that there is in the church both a strong organic union spirit as well as a strong non-organic-union spirit. To neglect this fact would be to render reconciliation or mediation impossible.

To my mind the point in Dr. Drummond's plan which needs to be made clear is whether there is to be a Federal Church or a Confederation of Churches under a Federal Council. When this point is cleared up it may be that Dr. Drummond's plan will prove to be the foundation of a real solution for the present situation which faces the church. I have incorporated Dr. Drummond's scheme, at the close of this book as Addendum II.*

(2) *Non-organic-union Presbyterians call for sacrifice as well as economy.*

"The saving of the Lord's men and the Lord's money" is considered a great gain by unionists (See Motives For Union). Non-unionists reply that this economy can be sufficiently gained by co-operation or federation. To press economy too far, they say, is again to introduce secular administration which clashes with the profound Presbyterian principle of spiritual administration. (This we have stressed in the section on losses in polity). "Where economy is an incentive to lowering the spiritual standard of sacrifice, it it obviously a tremendous loss."

---

*Dr. Drummond's plan appeared for the first time in the daily press, April 6, 1923. The plan given in the Addendum is the revision of it published in pamphlet form April 19, 1923.

(3) *Presbyterians love their church and do not want it extinguished by Act of Parliament.*

It is argued that a "legal entity" of churches is not spiritual union, and does not call for the obliteration of the Presbyterian name, traditions, and principles, and her imperial and world-wide connection with 100,000,000 Presbyterians. The Presbyterian Church in Canada is not dead, but has within it great power for good. It has a mission for Canada and the world which must be performed.*

In estimating the gains and losses, let it never be forgotten that the great reason for the existence of a visible, organized church, is that the divine life within the believer may find an adequate medium of expressing itself, in worship and service. To lose sight of this is to confuse the whole issue. Truth, which does not find expression, is of little value. The more perfect its expression, the more powerful and influential does any truth become. Therefore, if the United Church affords the believer a better medium of expressing the vital power of his inner experience, it will produce a better type of religious life. But when has it ever been found that the attempt to conform any experience to a limited method of outward expression has improved it? Has it not always had the opposite effect? Men are varied. Experiences differ. Ways of approaching God in worship, and of rendering to Him the best in service can never be limited. The deep experiences of life can never be standardized to any one plan. The best results are always obtained where the largest individual liberty is allowed. Therefore let us be careful how we attempt to limit the expression of the religious life of the people. Instead of seeking conformity to one plan, should we not rather encourage individual freedom, so that the ideal of every life may find its fullest realization?

To my mind this is the great weakness of the organic union movement. It forgets that the same longing for the right of individual expression which called into being these various churches still exists, and that to deny the right to full liberty of expression, no matter how high may be the motive which gives rise to it, is to strike at the very root of religious life, and nothing but disaster can follow.

---

*For many other detailed gains and losses, see Chapter II, A and B.

CHAPTER IV

What the New Standards of Faith Involve

FROM our studies as set forth especially in Chapter III, and Chapter V, the doctrinal implications seem to me to be as follows:—

(1) There is a wide diversity of opinion as to the value of the doctrinal basis and correlative parts of polity. This fact has been proven in an impartial way by a sufficient number of quotations from unionists and non-unionists alike.

(2) Likewise it has been shown that the almost unanimous judgment of those, who have given real thought to the Basis and have ability to think scientifically along such lines, is that the doctrinal basis is unsatisfactory, and should either be greatly improved or discarded altogether and a new one drawn up.

(3) The doctrine in the basis and even the polity is not a prime motive for or against union.

(4) Yet it is a motive against union on the part of a serious-minded and intense minority of both irreconcilable traditionalists and liberalists, who have really studied the Basis. If the rank and file of the church, not to mention the ministry, were to acquaint themselves with or be informed of the actual essence of the doctrine and polity, it is just possible that the minority who are opposed to union on this particular aspect of the question might become a majority. This is quite probable in the case of Presbyterian laymen, especially so if they once realized that the terms of doctrinal subscription really amount to no subscription whatsoever, and that in the matter of polity certain distinctly essential Presbyterian elements are eliminated.

(5) The proposed United Church will not stand where its component parts formerly stood as to doctrine and polity, nor as to doctrinal subscription so far as the Presbyterians and Methodists are concerned.

Apart from the fact that both doctrine and polity in the basis are a palpable compromise, and that there is the surprising fact of no doctrinal subscription, the proposed basis of union is just the traditional creeds with some relaxation, notably in the doctrines of election, of Scripture and of Sin.

In so far as the Calvinistic elements are toned down in the two Presbyterian Statements of Faith (English and American) which lie behind and are largely incorporated in the basis of union;* and in so far as there is no attempt to reconcile irreconcilable Calvinism and Arminianism but rather an attempt at comprehensiveness in order to conceal or obliterate, by omissions or parallelisms, these differences that help to keep people apart, and thus to avoid the doctrinal severities over which men used to quarrel,—to that extent there is a distinct advance on the old creeds.

(6) All this does not mean that the doctrinal basis of union is a real contribution to modern theology. As a matter of fact there is scarcely anything in it of the truly modern point of view, but on the other hand the statement is so drawn that modern men are not strangled. Nay more the glaring omission of subscription fought for by the Congregationalists is not a glorious affair, rather is it a very dangerous concession to men who may choose to run riot in the matter of doctrine, and thus a door is opened for all sorts of possible doctrinal errors.†

Apart from this defect of no subscription, the most we can say of the doctrinal articles of union is that they involve a certain desirable liberation from the old exclusive dogmatic positions. It is a sign of the decay of dogma; let us hope it is not a sign of indifference to doctrine generally.

(7) I am afraid, however, that there is a strong tendency to minimize the importance of sound doctrine. For example:—Many unionists and non-unionists alike have no particular doctrinal motives. A great many cold-bloodedly and proudly claim the union issue is wholly a practical one, and that they have no interest in, or concern, for doctrine. All this is

---

*See Chapter III, A.
†See Chapter III, C.

obviously true from my own study and observation. Some ministers have not even read the basis. Others I fear would have some difficulty in passing a surprise examination on their own Standards of Faith, especially those of the Presbyterian "persuasion."

Moreover, the doctrinal basis both in its process of production and in its final form is a most remarkable piece of evidence. The document indicates a determination to find some base of union no matter how many unsolved problems are left to future reconcilers.

(8) Nothing however more invites criticism than the fact that the doctrinal basis was the most easily achieved part of the work. It looks as if the so-called religious urgency was so overwhelming that theological diversity was deliberately eclipsed in a compendium or symposium of statements. So far as its contents have any theological significance, I fancy that there is not much that the average orthodox religious leader would wish to say that could not be said and defended as involved in some part of the statement.

The indifference to the purely historical aspect of controversies is marked. Indeed one may regret that so little time was given to stating what we stand for. But when that creed was drawn up the important thing was to assure people that we were not throwing to the scrap heap all the sacred things of the past. So many people seem to think that unless they tie the hands of all future generations the good God will be unable to control the church. They therefore wished to have everything that they believed or that others believed written down in black and white, with occasional diplomatic mollifications.

In other words, the real significance of the document is the document itself, as revealing a phase of religious life which was subordinating everything to the accomplishment of religious unity.

An honest man cannot but draw the implication from an impartial analysis of the doctrinal statement that it was unduly hastened, by what may prove to be an over-zealous human attempt to supplement a movement for organic union sincerely considered by many as of divine origin. This implication held by many non-unionists is confirmed for them, they claim, by the attempt now being made to bring about organic union, not by moral suasion under divine guidance, but by the enforcement of it through the proposed enabling legislation. Hence they feel that a hand, not from above, has interposed in this affair.

(9) There is no attempt to frame a new creed and some think this shows wisdom. They believe that the man or the committee that could construct a creed that would command the unreserved assent of the majority of Christian people, not to speak of all, does not exist. New ideas are in the air and are being assimilated, but the time to formulate them in credal form, they claim, has not arrived. When will it arrive? The Church is still fundamentally divided on the question. What is the Gospel; is it the religion which Jesus taught and lived or is it the religion based on a doctrinal construction of Christ's person and work? The difference between the two is not so far-reaching as it appears, but it is very real. In the meantime, they claim, we must be content with a more or less general assent to the historic creeds. These we do not scan so closely as we would a new creed. And they have the advantage of expressing the continuity of our church with the church of the past.

One might ask what is the function of a creed? A manifesto, a standard, signifying that is what the Church stands for. No existing creed serves that purpose. A legal document drawn up to test the orthodoxy of its members? Practically always members have been tried, not by the letter of any creed, but by the mind of the living church. It seems to me a Church has always some kind of creed even if it is unwritten or not established as a legal instrument. An implication of the union movement is, therefore, that the churches feel the need for a creed, but their joint committee on doctrine felt that they were not in a position to frame a new creed expressing a modern understanding of our faith.

(10) Another implication, whether union goes through or not, is that Presbyterians have been challenged as to the the suitability of the Westminster Confession for our day. For many years there has been a demand for a more modern

expression of our standards, or a change in the formula of adoption. This question was held up by the church union movement. If the Presbyterian Church continues it will have to settle this vital problem.

(11) In regard to the expression of a social gospel, neglected in the Basis, but which must inevitably come sooner or later, a note of warning is struck by an eminent scholar in a letter to me, in these words:

"When people get married they make no explicit agreement to eat bread and butter, but they go on eating bread and butter at the same table all their days. Some things may be taken for granted. And it may be that a social programme agreed on between the churches to-day would be like two people agreeing to live on bananas after they were married. They would feel the medievalism of such bonds within two days."

The implication here is that we must be very careful in our social pronouncements. "Man shall not live by bread alone," however important the "staff of life" may be. But the social gospel deals with a man's soul, in a humanitarian fashion as well as his stomach, and his mind. Man and humanity have taken on a new meaning and value, and this is and ought to be evidenced in the new emphasis on Social Christianity.

"With the rank and file to-day the test of the Gospel is its actual efficiency to bring the ideals of Jesus into social life. They have ceased to be interested in trinitarianism, foreordination, theories of the atonement, or even the infallibility of the Scriptures. They want something more modern. They require as a preliminary to their examination of the contents of the Christian revelation, the establishment of the reasonableness of the act and whole attitude of Christian faith. That done, they ask for a message adapted to the needs, not of an ancient, quiet, Oriental people, but to the busy, high-pressure life of the present, with all its problems, scientific and philosophical, materialistic and industrial."

(12) From the fact that the credal basis of union is too elaborate, contains much obscurantism, and is deficient in its recognition of the vital modern social problems, we may draw an implication as to the reason for this grave lack.

The general answer or implication is that the great majority of the men who framed the union statement were men of conservative temper, accustomed to an elaborate creed, and still entangled, however much some of them may assert the contrary, in a spirit of anxiety concerning the main points of Calvinism and Arminianism.

The suggestions that came mainly, though not entirely, from the Congregationalists that the time had come for something more in keeping with the modern mind did not appear to carry much weight. The chief motive in seeking to bring about the union was practical—the pressing needs of the country—and consideration of the broader doctrinal issues was largely thrown into the back-ground. Keen disappointment was felt by a small group when it was seen that such was the prevailing attitude. The Congregational representatives found some consolation, however, in having the concession made that men who were being ordained to the ministry were not required to give a categorical assent to the creed.

As to the failure to give any worthwhile recognition to the social aspects of the Gospel, that too is to be explained in similar fashion. The men who prepared the statement were to a very large extent trained in the older individualistic conception of the Gospel, and therefore did not give prominence to the other idea. Still it is not entirely left out. There is a hint of it in the last sentences in Articles XV. and XX.*

(13) Whilst the patch work method resulting in the present unsatisfactory union creed is to be deplored, and a fresh creed much to be preferred, yet one may honestly draw the implication that if the present doctrinal basis is to be retained it ought to be, and can be improved.

That it can be improved, I have no doubt, and therefore I beg to suggest how this may be done.

My criticism of it might be summed up generally in the following statements:—

(*a*) That it is too detailed.

(*b*) That it should, for such a statement, be more closely and organically knit together, and presented in a more logical order.

---

*See Appendix V.

(*c*) That it follows largely the old *schema* and by doing so perpetuates certain archaic expressions and statements which to-day are somewhat misleading.

To particularize:—

Article 1.—*On God.*—The Statement is a reflection of the Westminster formulation which is philosophical rather than distinctly Christian in character, e.g. "Infinite, eternal and unchangeable in His being and perfection." On the Christian view all the attributes of the Godhead in their expression and activity are determined by Father-love which is the central essence of Godhead; in the old way of putting it, Father-love is the absolute attribute of God in the Christian Revelation, all others are relative and theoretically are determined in their exercise and expression relatively to the ends of Father-love which is the central essence. This properly Christian perspective is not sufficiently brought out in the Statement—Art. I.

Articles II. and III. in my judgment might be omitted and their substance included under some other Article or articles, namely, Art. II. *On Revelation* would, it seems to me, more properly, as well as more helpfully, come under an Article on *The Holy Scriptures* which should be included in the Statement rather than, and instead of, the Article *On the Law of God* (XIV). Especially to-day some doctrinal statement should be made on the developmental and progressive character of the revelation as recorded in the Bible, and this would naturally come under an Article *On The Holy Scriptures.*

After Article I., On God, I would have, immediately following, one on Jesus Christ and then one on the Holy Spirit, forming Articles II. and III. respectively. That would form a more logical and helpful view of the christian doctrine of God.

Article IV., *On Creation and Providence,* might follow.

Next an Article (Art. V.) *On the Redeeming Love of God in Christ* (which would include the substance of Art. V.

On The Sin of Man and make a reference to Article on this unnecessary).

Then we could have the following Articles:—

Article VI.—*On the Church.*

Article VII.—*On the Holy Scriptures.*

Article VIII.—*On the Kingdom of God* particularly indicating the meaning of the coming of the Kingdom or 'The Coming of the Son of Man' which is progressive rather than catastrophic in character.

Article IX.—*On the Life to Come.*

This means Articles IX, X, XI, XII, in the present Basis of Union would be omitted, their substance so far as necessary to deal with them in such a statement to be included under some other Article, e.g. Article IX. *On Regeneration* might be included under the Article *On the Holy Spirit* or *On the Church* and similarly with regard to Articles X, XI, and XII.

Article XIX.—in the present Statement would certainly have to be either omitted or modified. It is Jewish apocalyptic doctrine rather than specially Christian, a criticism which applies also to the Westminster Standards. Compare by contrast the Article *On the Life to Come* in the Brief Statement of the Church's Faith (U.F.C. of Scotland, Appendix VII), which is much more in accord with the New Testament position.

Apart from this there is a flavour, too forensic or legal, sometimes even feudal, about some of the statements in these Articles in the Basis of Union, e.g., the phrase in Art. VI.—"God in His own good pleasure gave to His Son a people etc." recalls too closely the Shorter Catechism's statement (Q. 20), "In His mere good pleasure, elected some to everlasting life," suggesting to modern minds something of an arbitrary, aristocratic character about God's working out of His purposes, the very suggestion of which must be avoided. Again in Article XI "Accepts them as righteous and bestows upon them the adoption of sons, etc." is forensic in flavour rather than distinctly ethical and spiritual.

It is implied in what I have already said that the creed thus suggested would be very much shorter, and would emphasize the consent of the heart to a way of life rather than the assent of the mind to a number of doctrines.

As regards Doctrine, I sympathize with the position indicated by Dr. Denney in the closing pages of his "Jesus and the Gospel" where he indicates that *one Article* might be sufficient to express the distinctively Christian Creed. I would give probably different formulation to that one determining credal Article from that which Denney gives, something in this form:

"I believe in Jesus Christ my Saviour and Lord through surrender to whom I know God as my Heavenly Father reconciling me to himself and enabling me by His Spirit to live in newness of life to His praise and glory and for the bringing in of a new world of righteousness and brotherhood among men."

But of the creed in the basis! I dare not go so far as one of our illustrious scholars, (who by the way is an ardent unionist in the West), and say that the basis was dead practically from its birth. There is much good material in it. Not to admit this would do an injustice to the estimable men who framed it; although even those who survive of their number will admit it is not the work of giant creed builders. In fact they have told me this. Some of their words, the reader has already read in this discussion. Yet in all modesty, and not forgetful of what our venerable fathers of the negotiating churches have wrought, I submit that the basis of union is very inferior, for example, to the "Brief Statement of the Church's Faith", drawn up by the United Free Churchmen in Scotland (in 1921) as a feasible basis of union. This is published in Appendix VII, and I commend it to the serious consideration of the negotiating churches. It has the distinct merit of leaving out antiquated statements, and is an honest attempt to state the living mind of the church as represented by the pulpit to-day.

In Appendix VI. also is to be found a Statement of Faith—A Declaration of the National Congregational Council of 1913 (U.S.A.). This is the document, or the like of it, upon which the Congregationalists set their heart, in committee when the doctrinal basis was being framed.

It is still worth reconsideration. Perhaps it may be at least suggestive of a short creed for purposes of worship. It may be however, that for a confession, not mere affirmation of Faith, we need even a longer document than the Basis. This I presume is debatable.

To elaborate upon these suggestions of improving or discarding the present basis, would, I believe, be aside from the main drift of my purpose, and might even be considered by some as impertinence, if not anti-union propaganda. I disclaim any such unworthy motives. My anxiety is that the churches may stop! look! listen! Nay more, that their leaders may think more and if needs be invite others to assist them in the big task into which they have plunged themselves and their people. The old saying is still not without significance, "the more haste the less speed." Creeds are not made over night. They require years of calm, prayerful, spiritual and intellectual labor. If we are to have a real united church, not a new sect, nor a sectarian and fragmentary union, limited to two or three denominations, the creed must be profound, catholic, and exalting, one that is marked by the clear guidance of Almighty God, a movement from within, not an external, mechanical manipulation of men, however sincere and good. I press this point because while an optimist in a healthy way, I do fear the blight of a creedless church. A new and unsatisfactory creed may prove retrogressive and the source of grave divisions.

If it can be shown, not presupposed, that a big United Church is the ideal, then it is preeminently urgent that it be built upon rock not sinking sand, in all that goes to make a foundation, not the least important of which is sound doctrine of a kind that appeals to head and heart.

Meantime, while such a foundation is being sought for, the advice of the Rev. Dr. Richard Roberts of the American Presbyterian Church, Montreal, is well worth heeding:

"Personally, I am strongly of opinion that any attempt to formulate doctrinal statements as a basis of union is futile and mistaken. It should be enough to state generally that the basis of union is the catholic faith as handed down to us in the great documents and understood in the light of a Spirit which is continually revealing the mind of God to mankind.

"I wish somebody would attempt to formulate the religious outlook and try *that* as a basis of union. I think that we shall unite in the end on the basis of the things that we are doing together, rather than on the opinions we hold in common."

(14) If unionists sincerely desire the reunion of all Christian churches, not to mention the Roman Church, then the new creed should be broad enough for this big merger. Besides, now is the time to begin the process of study and construction of a basis in a truly statesmanlike manner.

There are many overhankering unionists who will criticize this statement, as they have already criticized many a time when some of our wisest and most scholarly leaders have made it. The invariable reply has been, "you are drawing a red herring across the trail of the present union movement. We will consummate the present merger, then the others may come in, in fact they will want to come in." I protest against this kind of logic. Even if it were true, what of it? If it be shown that less haste and more thought is needed, then why not move slowly, wisely, and thoughtfully. To illustrate my contention, I quote the words of a warm unionist, whom I consider one of the most loving and most powerful ministers in Canadian Methodism. He said to me in private:

"The new creed must have as its key-note faith in the lordship of Jesus Christ. It should be as brief, inevitable, unquestionable as possible, with a large amount of liberty. The coming of the Anglicans would recast the whole thing, not without explosion and injury to our practical church work. A spiritual revival of a social and mystical type is necessary to get them over their stress on doctrinal differences. An Anglican annex to the creed will not do it."

No Anglican annex to the Creed will suffice. That is true. Yet is it true that a revival is any more necessary for the Anglicans, than for the negotiating churches and all other Christian communions, including the Baptists?

Let us, then, try to make our creed or basis of union in a big, loving, Christian way, and not contradict our profession by narrowness and prejudice. A big spiritual movement must be wrought out in big spiritual fashion. No other scheme will suffice. Has Canada this larger vision, or are we trifling with something about which we are not sincere? If we are sincere, do we give up on the ground of political expediency? I for one deprecate politics in religion.

(15) Am I unfair to venture as another implication that the distinctly doctrinal part of the basis, in its sources and development, has been amended and revised, so that, as a Western leader asserts, "it is more notable for what it does not say than for what it does say."

(16) It does seem to me that with a broad spiritual interpretation of doctrine, it is possible to find a basis of union for the vast majority. Absolute unanimity on doctrine may not be possible unless the irreconcilable Traditionalists and the extreme Liberals are willing to give and take? Why should they not? Who dare claim a monopoly of Divine Truth?

"It has been my privilege" writes Rev. Professor Clogg, in the Expository Times, "to be present at several gatherings of clergy and ministers in the last few years, and I confess that the divergence of the views expressed would sometimes have made me despair had there not always been felt a spirit of fellowship which was more real than the things which divided us. It is said that there is a point high up in the air where sounds that are discordant below lose their discord and blend in harmony, and we believe that there is one spirit, who is leading us all upwards along different paths, and that if we are faithful to His guidance we shall find those paths presently converge.

There's a legion that never was listed,
    That carries no banner nor crest,
But split in a thousand detachments
    Is breaking the road for the rest.

It is something at any rate if any of us can play some little part in "breaking the road for the rest."

The same writer utters these suggestive words:—

"There will be no real use in a new creed unless it is born, not out of bitter controversy, like so many others but out of great faith and expressed, not in the too often arid forms of the theological schools, but in the language of the heart, which is understood in all generations.

"The common ground among Christians of all communions is that they love the same things, rather than that they think the same. To-day the emphasis is being more and more laid on religion as an experience not a formula, a life not a system. It may be doubted whether Paul and James, Origen and Francis of Assisi, Ignatius Loyola, Luther, Wesley, Newman, Kingsley, and General Booth would all have subscribed to the same creed; they were much nearer each other in experience than in intellectual beliefs. They were one in the reality of their experience of communion with God in Christ. The simple and ignorant man who, once a slave of vice, has known his personality cleansed, and recreated through Christ, is much nearer to the author of the Fourth Gospel in his spiritual experience than in adherence to the Logos doctrine. If in the re-united church this experiential side of the one Faith can be emphasized; if 'I trust in' be substituted for, or added to, 'I believe in', then a creed is most desirable. For here surely is where we are all one—Greek, Roman, Anglican, Free Church, Society of Friends. That which makes the Holy Communion Service precious to us all is our experience of the presence of Christ, our sense of communion with God. We all have our different theories about it; they divide us; but our experience already unites us. Therefore, if any form of words can be found in which this common experience is implicit—obviously it can never be made adequately explicit—it will make more vivid to us our sense of fellowship with the noblest souls who have ever lived or are now living on this earth. A creed understood in that sense would be a symbol of unity, not an acid test to keep people away. Inevitably a creed will exclude; but if it symbolizes a way of life, and is not merely a statement of truth, which must become outgrown because of the development of human knowledge, those who will be kept out are those who are not willing to do the will of God in order to know of its truth, not those whose minds are but poorly furnished with theological knowledge, nor those who, to use a recent phrase of Canon Lyttelton's, refuse to attempt 'to define and cabin the infinite love of God'.

"The historic creeds grew by a process of definition of errors. The creed of the re-united church must be the spontaneous expression of those great truths by which men live, not the attenuated result of years of controversy acclaimed as a triumph of ecclesiastical strategy. Men are generally more right in what they affirm than in what they deny. A statement of religious rather than theological convictions is certainly desirable, and, I should say, necessary to the well-being of the Church.

'We ought to know and to affirm the unity which binds us together.' Of course there are varieties of experience, but they are on another plane from the widely differing schools of thought. We have long been singing the same hymns together, and praying the same prayers, and it is not without significance that 'the most sacred form of words and the most typical of Christianity is a prayer—the Lord's Prayer.' Therein is an expression of the personal trust which is of the essence of religion, and no man can recite those familiar words without being reminded of the practical issue of that trust: 'Thy Kingdom come, thy will be done'."

An extract from "Restatement and Reunion" by the Rev. Dean B. H. Streeter, of Queen's College, Oxford, is worth insertion and consideration, at this point:

"Asking myself how I should interpret to myself in the simplest form (and independent of all those subleties of historical criticism or metaphysics, the hazardous and conjectural nature of which, are best known to those who have most closely studied them) and, of course, only in the barest outline, the essence of the Christian message, it seemed to me to be included in six main ideas—each in itself ineffably simple yet each infinitely expansive in its practical application:

(1) Christianity is a disposition of the soul: "Thou shalt love the Lord Thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy mind," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

(2) A resultant course of action: "If any man would be my disciple let him take up his cross and follow me."

(3) A consequent achievement: "'If any man will do His will he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God."

(4) If it be asked "Who is sufficient for these things?" There is the promise of a response on the part of the Divine to such feeble efforts as we may make: "Knock, and it shall be open to you." "My grace is sufficient for thee."

(5) There is the assurance that failure can be retrieved: "For this My Son was dead and is alive again, he was lost and is found."

(6) There is the sure and certain hope: "This is the promise which is promised us, even life eternal."

(17) There is a doctrinal implication in regard to the Polity* which, too, is a sign of progress. With the exception of a few old-fashioned folk, it is no longer generally claimed by the negotiating churches that their own particular form of government was divinely instituted in the New Testament.

---

*See Chapter V.

The implied old-fashioned view that forms of church government are divinely ordained, and founded indisputably upon New Testament basis, is rather antiquated. In fact modern Christian scholarship has proved such a claim to be precarious and unwise.

The Church in my own view is just a means to the end of the Kingdom of God on earth, and its form will naturally vary according to experience. I personally much prefer the Presbyterian polity to any other kind, and I am not at all sure that the polity in the basis is an improvement upon or even as good as the Presbyterian system. My main complaint is that it is not definitely worked out and completed. It is no consolation to be told that the final readjustment and settlement of questions of polity will be cared for by the United Church. We ought to demand a definite solution of some sort now.*

The logical implication, following from the modern admission that we no longer need claim for our respective denominational polities New Testament sanction at the expense of one another, is that most people are ready, if necessary, to vary the polity according to the experience in order to do better work.

Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, of New York, in his book entitled "In a Day of Social Rebuilding (1919)" has made a very wise pronouncement relative to polities, as follows:

"There are some facts concerning existing organizations to be borne in mind:—

"One is that, while polities are not equally favorable to the cultivation of the various gifts of the Spirit, one finds a striking similarity of gifts in all communions of the Church, when one looks beneath the different labels attached to various functions and offices. A veteran Baptist missionary may abhor the title but exercise all the authority of a diocesan bishop, and a strong Methodist congregation may be as independent as many a Congregational church. On the other hand identity in name by no means implies identity in gift. The episcopal office in the days of Charles the Second in the Anglican Church is quite different from that office in the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, and an elder in a Presbyterian Church in New York City a century ago discharged other duties than those now laid on his titular successors. The Church, no more than other institutions in a changing world, can keep an unchanging form. To see her spiritual continuity chiefly in the unbroken succession of a particular office is to see it in a mere name that alters its significance with the circumstances of the age and land in which the church finds herself. The continuity is in the one enriching Spirit of life who lives in the organism through the centuries, distributing His gifts as freely as the fellowship will receive and employ them. We should study what gifts the situation in any place or in the world of our day demands, and shape polity to provide for their development and exercise, confident that the indwelling Spirit will not fail us.

---

*See Chapter V.

"A second is the possibility even under present conditions of borrowing from other polities and incorporating in one's own most of their useful features. An Episcopal rector may lead his vestry to assume the responsibilities of spiritual oversight borne by a Presbyterian session. The Methodist conception of a class-leader may be advantageously employed in other communions to care for new members. Episcopal and Methodist deaconesses are coming into vogue in Presbyterian and Congregational churches. In polity, as in worship, the more extensively we borrow from one another, the more we shall enrich our several communions and bring unity before the day of reunion. Gregory the Great, according to Bede, gave Augustine of Canterbury wise counsel: 'You know, my brother, the custom of the Roman Church wherein you yourself were bred. But it pleases me that if you have found anything either in the Roman, or in the Gallican, or in any other Church, which may be more acceptable to Almighty God, you carefully make choice of the same, and teach it to the Church of the English which is but new in the Faith. Choose therefore from every church those things which are pious, religious and upright; and when you have as it were made them into one body, let the minds of the English be accustomed thereto."

(18) Since unionists and non-unionists differ so widely in their views of doctrine expressed in the basis and elsewhere, and further since so many of our very finest and ablest, christian professors, ministers, officials, and laymen favour organic union or at least some closer drawing together of all the churches, is there not another vital implication? The implication is that for the sake of such practical unity of association it would surely be worth while to yield a larger toleration to different intellectual conceptions of the truth. Might there not even be real Christian edification for

all in having to listen, perhaps within the same place of worship, to varying expressions of the truth as conceived by the human mind?

Dr. Marcus Dods (in "First Corinthians"—Expositor's Bible, pp. 94-95) has acutely observed: "It has been the weakness of Christians in all ages, and never more than in our own, to see good in only one aspect of truth and listen to no form of teaching but one......We know that to confine ourselves to one form of food induces poverty of blood and disease, and yet we fancy a healthy spiritual life can be maintained only by confining ourselves to one form of doctrine and one way of looking at universal truth. To the Evangelical who shrinks with horror from liberal teaching, and to the advanced thinker who turns with contempt from the Evangelical, Paul would say, Ye do yourselves a wrong by listening to one form of the truth only; every teacher who declares what he himself lives on has something to teach you; to despise or neglect any form of Christian teaching is so far to impoverish yourselves. "All things are yours," not this teacher or that, in whom you glory, but all teachers of Christ."

Another saintly scholar has written:

> "It may take long to break down so completely the bad tradition of the necessity of intellectual unanimity for organized Christian unity. But more now, a great deal, than when it was first addressed to contending churchmen, there is a widespread and intelligent disposition to press upon them something like the advice of Erasmus:—'Reduce the dogmas necessary to be believed to the smallest possible number; you may do so without any injury to the realities of Christianity. As regards all other points, either discourage inquiry or leave every one to believe what he pleases. Then we shall cease from quarrelling; and religion will again take hold of life."

(19) Unquestionably the opposition in our church to union with the Methodists has one of its deepest roots in the feeling that the Methodist ethics and temper are not ours. My own impression is that there is something in this, but I should shrink from claiming moral superiority. An implication of the union movement is therefore that, with many community of temper is of more importance than community in creed and church organization.

(20) A further implication is the undoubted weakening in denominationalism. In the West in particular, denominational loyalty is almost a thing of the past. So far as this means indifference towards unimportant differences in doctrine and organization this is surely to the good. I am not sure whether indifference with respect to denominational history is wholly a bad thing: certainly not bad if it means a larger vision of the cause which the Church exists to serve. On the other hand indifference to denominational history is not only bad but very bad if it leads us to superficial thinking in doctrinal essentials, in lack of charity and sympathy with those who love the church of their fathers, and particularly so if that lack is carried to the point of cold-blooded coercion of any sincere minority into a united church against their consent, or by using the club of enabling legislation in such a way as to suppress political and religious liberty won by their fathers, who shed their life-blood for those precious principles still cherished by all fair-minded Britishers.

(21) The final doctrinal implication is one which I wish to state very emphatically. If it is true that the interest of unionists is a non-theological interest, then the logical basis of union would be not doctrine but motives and work, common to the three negotiating Churches.

Our study thus far has shown clearly that the kind of Christianity, desired by many Unionist leaders in Canada, is of a non-doctrinal type. Hence the logical deduction as to the kind of union needed to solve the common problems confronting the negotiating Churches, is not a scheme of organic union demanding uniformity of doctrine and polity. On the contrary, common motives and tasks would find more adequate expression through the scheme of union set forth in the last chapter of this book. That is to say, through Church Federation or the like, rather than through Church Union based on an artificial and futile attempt to unite organically incoherent and sometimes defunct doctrines. Thoughtful leaders of the union movement must know this. At any rate the present doctrinal basis of union is so unsatisfactory that they neither believe it nor subscribe to it. They do, however, accept it temporarily, not out of spiritual conviction, but solely for the purpose of speeding up the consummation of organic union, and thereby the establishment of the so-called United Church of Canada. My correspondence and interviews with these leaders substantiate this affirmation.

Therefore we may rightly conclude that Federal Union would be more natural, more genuine, more spiritual, and altogether more logical than organic union. Besides it would render more practicable the achievement of all those desired objectives, which naturally flow from the well-spring of the Christian motives and tasks common to the three Churches concerned; simply because these very things are the logical basis of union. They are indigenous to a great alignment of Christian forces on a Federal or similar plan; whereas in the scheme of the proposed organic union, doctrine is foreign to its basis of union. Of course there is a doctrinal basis proposed, but at best it is merely an enabling measure to bring about organic union, which, as we have stated, obviously involves a futile attempt to merge organically doctrines that will not merge. As a matter of fact if they could be merged in their present form, they would not, even then, express the living mind of the Church in Canada to-day. Federation steers clear of this difficulty, avoids the inevitable evils of an ecclesiastical merger, and best of all accomplishes all the Christian objectives desired, and that—in a happy, comprehensive, and really spiritual way.

CHAPTER V

Church Government in the Basis of Union

A. *Introduction*: The Polities of the Negotiating Churches outlined.

1. The Congregational Polity. This polity has been outlined clearly and adequately enough for our purpose in Chapter III. E. I. The reader is therefore referred to it.

2. The Methodist Polity.*

"Theology is practically the same for all branches of Methodism: The usual standards are the four volumes of Wesley's sermons and his Notes on the New Testament. But the constitution and government of the Church has occasioned the most serious division within the parent body itself, and the separate denominations diverge here somewhat widely.... Only a broad statement therefore is possible..... It was not Wesley's aim to create a Church, but a collection of societies within the Church of England. The Sacrament of the Lord's supper was administered to the members of the societies by ordained clergymen of whom there were several associated with the Wesleys. Ministerial status was not accorded to the preachers of the Connexion. The Connexion, however, was independent of the Church of England in the management of its affairs. Wesley kept the government in his own hands, but united with himself a Conference of Methodist preachers. The logical issue of his movement was inevitably to detach his Connexion from the Anglican Church."†

Wesley rejected Apostolic Succession. Sacraments, he believed, could not secure salvation; regeneration did not come through baptism. Wesley ordained a number of his preachers. This ordination naturally meant separation from the Church of England, for these Methodist preachers were considered merely as unordained laymen from the Anglican point of view.

---

*See Chapter III. E. II, and the *Canadian Meth. Book of Discipline.*

†Peake—*Evangelical Christianity,* edited by Dr. Selbie.

This constituted a serious bar to union with the Mother Church.

"The government of the Church, speaking broadly, conforms to the Presbyterian type. It is true that in some important points the comparison would be misleading. But the series of courts culminating in the Conference presents a marked similarity to Presbyterianism. A number of individual societies are commonly grouped in a circuit of which there is a superintendent minister who may have one or more colleagues. A number of circuits are grouped in a district. Each district holds a yearly Synod before Conference. The Conference is the supreme court of the Denomination. On other points of the elaborate organization, quarterly meetings, leaders' meetings, circuit, district, and conferential committees, I must not linger; nor on the detailed difference between the various denominations in the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline."*

The Methodist is one of those Christian denominations that cannot very easily be brought under any one of the four radically different theories on the subject of Church Polity.†

"The Methodists are closely allied in their original constitution to the Anglican Mother Church in the rigid suppression of the voice of the laity in the government of the church, which among the Wesleyans is mainly in the hands of the selected clergymen who form the Conference; while the partial distinction introduced in clerical rank by the appointment of Presidents of Circuits is somewhat parallel to the temporary expedient of Superintendents in the Scottish Church of the Reformation. The history of Methodism shows an unstable equilibrium, vibrating between the original high clerical and the more recent anti-clerical extremes."‡ These differences I shall not ennumerate. But a word from Dr. Campbell, ex-clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, is relative to our discussion. He wrote: "On the question of church government, Methodists have no fixed principles. John Wesley had no admiration for government by

---

*Peake—*Evangelical Christianity,* edited by Dr. Selbie.
†See Hodge on four kinds of Polity, re *What is Presbyterianism?*
‡Macpherson,—*Presbyterianism,* T. & T. CLARKE.

Kirk-Sessions and Presbyteries, any more than he had for the manner of ordaining ministers or the administering of the communion or the burial of the dead in Scotland. He was a ritualistic Episcopalian; and, in the United States, the form of government which he started amongst his followers in that country, when he ordained a bishop and sent him to them, has continued until the present. For some time a section of the Methodists in Canada was also episcopally governed, although it was afterwards merged in a system much like that prevailing in England, a certain aristocracy, called "the stationing committee," having the appointment of ministers to charges in their hands. The system of government generally prevailing in the Methodism of the Dominion is approximating more nearly to Presbyterianism, laymen now sharing in their Conferences, local and general, although there is at their head a permanent presiding officer, styled "General Superintendent."*

3. The Presbyterian Polity.†

Before giving a sketch of the Polity in the Basis of Union and criticism thereof, the following orthodox statement of Presbyterian polity is of interest because it is still more or less held by all Presbyterians:

> "As to the Government of the Church, Presbyterians hold that while at first, and for a time, there were extraordinary, inspired office-bearers, such as the apostles, yet that the ordinary, permanent office-bearers are presbyters, or bishops, and deacons; that the special duty of deacons is to care for the temporal wants of the poor, and to attend to other matters of a similar kind; and that to the bishops, or presbyters, have been committed the oversight and government of the church in spiritual matters. They hold that the bishops or overseers and presbyters or elders are all of one rank, and that these names are but different names for the same office; the term bishop or overseer indicating the duties, the term presbyter or elder indicating the rank of these office-bearers. In the Churches of England and Rome it is held that the bishop is a prelate superior to the presbyter, and that he alone is entitled to ordain and to administer what is called the rite of confirmation. For this superiority Presbyterians allege there is no warrant in Scripture. They point, on the contrary, to several

---

***The Relations of the Christian Churches,* (Wm. Briggs, Toronto).

†See relative portions in Chapter III. E. III, on Presbyterian Polity.

passages in which the names presbyter or elder and bishop or overseer are used interchangeably as different names of the same office. Thus, in the twentieth chapter of Acts, the same persons who are called elders or presbyters in the seventeenth verse are, in the twenty-eighth verse, called overseers or bishops. On this passage Dean Alford remarks that the English version has hardly dealt fairly in this case with the sacred text in rendering *episkopous,* verse 28, "Overseers": "Whereas it ought there, as in all other places, to have been bishops, that the fact of elders and bishops having been originally and apostolically synonymous might be apparent to the ordinary English reader, which now it is not." The identity of bishops and elders is also proved by Titus I. 5-9, and I. Tim. iii. 1-7, in which they are represented as needing the same qualifications and called to discharge the same duties, and in which the names are used interchangeably; and also by Philip I. 1, from which it appears that there were at Philippi several bishops, who could not all have been prelates in the modern sense of the word. On the last-mentioned text the learned Bishop Lightfoot thus writes in one of his notes: "In the opening of this epistle St. Paul salutes the 'Bishops' and 'deacons'. Now, it is impossible that he should recognize only the first and third order and pass over the second, though the second was absolutely essential to the existence of a church and formed the staple of its ministry. It seems therefore to follow of necessity that the 'bishops' are identical with the 'presbyters'.

"It is claimed, however, on behalf of Prelacy, that it existed or prevailed at an early time in the Christian church. But, with the exception of the spurious or interpolated letters of Ignatius, there are no traces of it in the writings of the Apostolic fathers, in which the terms presbyter and bishop are used interchangeably. "It is certain," says Dean Stanley, in his tenth essay on Christian Institutions, "that throughout the first century, and for the first years of the second, that is through the later chapters of the Acts, the apostolical epistles, and the writings of Clement and Hermas, bishop and presbyter were convertible terms, and that the body of men so called were the rulers—so far as any permanent rulers existed—of the early church." In regard to the government of the church and the origin of Prelacy, Jerome, the most learned of the Latin fathers, writes that "among the ancients, bishops and presbyters are the same," and that "when afterwards one presbyter was elected that he might be placed over the rest, this was done as a remedy against schism;" and further, that bishops are "above presbyters, more by the custom of the church than by the true dispensation of Jesus Christ." It is admitted that Prelacy existed in the second, and prevailed in the following centuries, till it was, to a large extent, superseded by the Papal system; but it is contended that neither system is warranted by Scripture or the practice of the early church.

"Regarding the elders or bishops of the church as being all of one rank, Presbyterians, nevertheless, hold that while it is the special duty of some elders to rule, there are others who, being qualified to teach, are called to teach, as well as to rule."*

My Note—I cannot accept Dr. Gregg's statement "Regarding the elders or bishops of the church as being all of *one rank* etc,"† unless it be clearly understood that the equality referred to is that of equal authority in their respective spiritual offices. I do not mean by this that there is any superiority of the ministry over the eldership. A few so-called High Presbyterians repudiate the view that elders are of two kinds, viz., teaching and ruling elders. They claim ministers are more than teachers. Moreover they assert that ministers are not elders, just a little raised above the ordinary eldership. On the contrary they hold that ministers are ordained and elders merely admitted, and that ordination of elders has been in vogue less than 100 years. Thus they conclude that ministers being in the line of spiritual succession through ordination, and having higher offices to perform than elders who are laymen, are, therefore, of superior rank. I do not think such a viewpoint can be substantiated. Presbyterianism knows no class distinction in officers. All are absolutely equal in the sight of Jesus Christ the only Head of the Church. Admission by prayer, or ordination by laying on of hands, in regard to the eldership is merely a matter of practice.‡ Cases could be cited to prove that the choice of either practice is optional. Ordination and admission are therefore equivalent. The real point is that ministers and elders are both spiritual officers with sacred functions to perform, and there is absolutely no higher or lower rank of officers or offices. Both ministers and elders are equal in authority as to their spiritual functions which are different in kind but not in rank. The one is based on "helps" of the New Testament, the other on "Presbyters" of the New Testament. The fact that the Westminster Church Government calls for ordination of the ministry by the laying on of hands, and that of the eldership by prayer does not affect the rank, so as to make

---

*Gregg,—*History of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.*

†Ibid, above.

‡Hill,—*View of Constitution of Church of Scotland* (3rd. Ed.) p. 49.

the minister the superior to the elder.* This is the commonly accepted view of the Protestant Reformed churches.

The "Form of Government" of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland says: "As there were in the Jewish Church elders of the people joined with the Priests and Levites in the government of the Church, so Christ, who hath instituted government and governors ecclesiastical in the church, hath furnished some in His church, besides the ministers of the word, with gifts of government, and with commission to exercise the same when called thereunto, who are to join with the Minister in the government of the church. Which officers Reformed churches commonly call elders." This quotation from the standard of the Church of Scotland declares the office to be distinct. This does not however, imply, in any sense whatsoever, a height or inferiority of rank or of separate spiritual functions. Equal spiritual authority is essential under the sole headship of Christ.

Some say: "Accurately viewed, pure Presbyterianism never calls a minister an elder. He is a Presbyter, not a teaching elder." In the United States a minister is not permitted to be a member of Session. In Canada he is sometimes called upon to act in the capacity of elder, but this is alien to Presbyterianism.

"The fact is that Elders are chosen from the Christian laity by the Kirk Session of each (Scottish) parish, and are publicly admitted to office by the minister with prayer. Their appointment was originally annual, but under present legislation lasts as long as local connection is maintained. The office can be resigned...... As representing the Flock of God, as well as by the solemnity of their admission, and by the extent and weight of the duties entrusted to them, their office may be considered a spiritual office of high dignity and importance. It is not, however, an order of the sacred Ministry, and it includes none of the functions of the presbyterate in relation to Worship, Sacraments, or Orders. They are representatives of the flock, taking part with the Ministry (1) in matters of discipline, (2) in government, (3) in administration of affairs. The name elder, in this connection is not

---

*See Hodge's, *What is Presbyterian Law,* p. 54 ff.

derived from the Scriptural word Presbyter, but of the Latin Senior, or French Seigneur, as then and still employed in the Reformed churches of France and Switzerland. The precedent quoted indicates "Elders of the people."*

On the other hand we read in Mair's Digest of Church Laws, p. 126:—"All are elders—ministers being teaching or preaching as well as ruling elders, and the others "ruling elders" only. Ministers and elders have an equal voice on every subject as members of a church court, and all the same responsibility. Ruling elders in the Presbytery do not lay on hands at the ordination of a minister, for this is outside of ruling; but they share in every step thereto." Moreover in the U. P. and U. F. Churches of Scotland "an ordained minister, who is without pastoral charge, is eligible as a Ruling Elder in the congregation to which he belongs."†

The point in all this to be carefully noted is that "the eldership is a spiritual function as is the ministry" (2 B. Dis., Chap. VI), and that there is no superiority or higher order of the ministry over the eldership. For example,—in the first days of the Reformation, Rev. Alex. Wardlaw of Ballingry, charged with disobedience to the Superintendent of Fife, was tried by the minister and elders of St. Andrew's Kirk Session 1561.‡

Reverting to Dr. Gregg's statement, we read:

"In justification of this view they point to the fact that there were several elders or bishops in particular churches, as at Philippi, and allege that it is unlikely that all were teaching elders, and that it is more probable that some were merely ruling elders. They point also to the names "helps", "governments", "teachers", as serving to imply a distinction between teaching and ruling elders, in respect to the duties for which they were severally qualified, and which they actually discharged; a distinction which is more clearly indicated in the following texts: "Having, then, gifts differing according to the grace that is given us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth on teaching; or he that exhorteth on exhortation; he that giveth let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth with diligence;"

---

*See, *A Manual of Church Doctrine,* Wotherspoon and Kirkpatrick, pp. 177-9.

†See, *The Practice of the Free Church;* Moncrieff.

‡*Kirk Session Register;* Scottish Historical Society.

"Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in word and doctrine." (Rom. XII. 6-8, II Tim. V. 17.)*

"It is further held by Presbyterians that it is the privilege of Christian congregations to elect their own office-bearers; and that their rights are violated when either civil magistrates or ecclesiastical rulers intrude upon them ministers, elders, or deacons, without their call or consent. They read in the Acts of the Apostles that the deacons were elected by the people. They read also in ecclesiastical history that in later times, even after the Prelatic and Papal systems were introduced, it was the acknowledged privilege of the Christian people to elect bishops, patriarchs, metropolitans and popes, by popular vote, although the civil magistrate frequently interfered. They therefore feel themselves warranted in claiming for Christian congregations the right to elect their own office-bearers; while at the same time they hold that ministers should be ordained, as Timothy was, "by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.

"From the practice of the church, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, and especially from the account given of a reference from the brethren at Antioch and the proceedings and decisions of the Synod at Jerusalem, it has been reasonably inferred by Presbyterians that there should be a subordination of church courts; and accordingly they have their Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies subordinate, the lower to the higher courts. In this matter they keep in view the principle laid down in the Westminster Confession of Faith, that there are some circumstances, not only concerning the worship of God, but also concerning the government of the church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the rules of the Word; and they are fully satisfied that the subordination of church courts, as judged by principles of Christian expediency, is highly advantageous. By this arrangement the rights of each member of the church are protected; for, every one who feels himself aggrieved by the decision of an inferior can appeal to the higher or to the highest court, in which he may hope that correct decisions will be given. This arrangement, also, is fitted to preserve the unity of the church and to promote its efficiency, as, for example, in testifying against errors and immoralities; in maintaining sound doctrine; in providing for the education, and deciding on the qualifications, of candidates for the ministry; and in carrying on missionary operations at home and abroad.

"In regard to some matters of subordinate importance there are differences of opinion and practice among Presbyterians;

---

*Gregg,—*History of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.*

but in the great leading principles which have been indicated in the preceding sketch, there is substantial agreement among the different Presbyterian churches; among which are included not merely those usually called Presbyterian in the British Empire and the United States, but also the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists, and those called the "Reformed" as distinguished from the Lutheran churches in France, Holland, Germany, Switzerland and other parts of Europe and in the United States of America."*

B. *Historical Sketch of the Polity in Basis of Union.*

The two letters which follow, were written to me, by a very important member of the Committee, to whom was assigned the task of drawing up the Union Polity. So far as I have been able to ascertain, my correspondent, probably more than any other one member of the Committee, is responsible for the proposed polity. I am compelled to say in the interest of scientific search after truth, that these letters appear to me to contain a theory of polity not founded on historic and scientific interpretation of church polities, but rather are they the expression of the theory of the individual correspondent, emanating from his own astute mind, and apparently for the purpose of bolstering up and justifying the polity as it now stands in the proposed Basis of Union.

LETTER No 1.

This letter dated Dec. 21, 1922, is as follows: "If you compare the Polity adopted for the United Church you will find that it shows many resemblances to the Presbyterian Polity, with some striking features of the Methodist system.

"In the discussions two views emerged—the Federal or Central and the Local or Independent. One regarded the organization of the church as emanating from a central authority which delegated powers to subordinate bodies. It may be tracable to the Episcopal tradition. The necessities of missionary work forced even the Independents to admit that it made for efficiency. The other view started with the local charge which came into voluntary association with other charges and conferred upon the Association such powers as seemed necessary. This Association in the Presbyterian Church became ultimately the source of authority. The

---

*Gregg,—*History of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.*

Presbytery thus stands between the Central Authority and the Local Unit. It controls the local charge in essentials and retains its liberties against the pretensions of the Central Authority. The Barrier Act, the bulwark of Presbyterianism is retained in the Polity of the United Church."

MY NOTE—This paragraph may be an accurate account of the discussion that took place at the Committee, but it is hopelessly incorrect as a true account of Church Polities. For example:—(1) Federal or Central are regarded as synonymous. This is impossible because they work in opposite directions. (2) "Organization as emanating from a central authority which delegates power to subordinate bodies," may be claimed by ultra High Presbyterians as pure Presbyterianism, not traceable to the Episcopal tradition. However, the more correct and recognized view is to the contrary. There is no central authority in the Presbyterian Church at the top which delegates power to subordinate bodies. Authority in the Presbyterian Church is derived from no church court, but directly from the Lord. The General Assembly is not the unit; the Presbytery is the unit.* Moreover, if as my correspondent says, this is traceable to the Episcopal tradition, then to that extent it is connected historically with the government of the church of the Holy Roman Empire, against which Protestant reformers revolted. (3) The statement that "this Association in the Presbyterian Church became ultimately the source of authority," is not Presbyterian but savours of Congregational connexion in so far as it broke away from Independency. (4) The Barrier Act is described in the letter as "the bulwark of Presbyterianism". As a matter of fact it is not a part of pure Presbyterian tradition, but is a self-imposed check on hasty legislation within the Presbyterian Church itself. The fact of the "unconstitutional use of the Barrier Act by the Assembly to bring about Union," and also "the unconstitutional revised interpretation of it by the Winnipeg Assembly," is not mentioned by my correspondent).†

---

*See section on Assembly, Presbytery, and Rights of the People, near the close of this chapter.

†See section on The Barrier Act at the close of this chapter.

Letter No. I, continues:

"In the report of the Union Committee in the Assembly Minutes of 1906 there is a very significant suggestion. It was proposed by Mr. Justice McLaren that to the Assembly of the United Church be left the task of working out the organization of the new church, subject to certain general principles.

"The following summer a number of local joint committees worked on the Polity and certain individuals prepared a draft very similar to that ultimately adopted. At the next meeting of the Joint Committee it soon became apparent, in the discussions of the Joint Sub-Committee on Polity that no progress could be made until something happened. When the Sub-Committee on Polity reported to the Joint Committee, the Presbyterians led by Dr. Gordon stated that it would never do to leave the Polity to be worked out after Union. Their objections prevailed and the whole matter was referred to a greatly enlarged committee. When the Committee met, Rev. Dr. Carman was called to the Chair, and after hearing some desultory discussion summed up the situation as due to a difference of opinion as to whether the organization should proceed from the Local Unit to the Central body or vice versa, and declared his readiness to try the Congregational and Presbyterian plan of proceeding from the Local Unit.

(My Note:—"The Congregational and Presbyterian plan of proceeding from the Local Unit" is an entirely incorrect statement. It wrongly assumes an identity between these two systems, whereas the Unit of Presbyterianism is the Presbytery, not the local congregation.)

"The draft prepared by the Local Committee in the Maritime Provinces, which was printed before the meeting was then considered in detail and in the main adopted.

"As you will observe it was decided to effect Union with as little disturbance of the local charges as possible. The opening paragraph of the Polity was drafted by Hon. N. W. Rowell, K.C."

(My Note:—Mr. Rowell was also Chairman of the Legal Committee, under whose supervision the Proposed Enabling Legislation was drawn up. His introduction to the Polity is not borne out by an analysis of the Polity itself, as we shall see).

"In the organization of the congregation the Session retains much of its Presbyterian importance—an importance never assumed by the leaders or local preachers. The Quarterly Board of the Methodist Church provides an opportunity for Session and Managers to work together.

"The powers and duties of the Session and of the Presbytery in the United Church are similar to those of the Presbyterian save in two important particulars. The ordination of the ministers is reserved for the Conference, though the Presbytery has the right to examine and recommend; the settlement of the ministers is to be effected through a Settlement Committee to be appointed by Conference. The Methodist Conference has supervision of the conduct of ministers. This remains with Presbytery in the United Church. Conference, not Presbytery, appoints representatives to the Council.

"Thus in the United Church the Session of the Presbyterian Church, the prominence of Presbytery in large measure, the Barrier Act and the general powers of the Council (Assembly) have been retained; while the Quarterly Board, the ordination and settlement of ministers by the Methodist Conference and the less frequent meeting of the Council, which will make it more of a legislative and less of an administrative body with a consequent shifting of power and importance to Conference, have been retained. The Presbyterian system emphasizes Session, Presbytery and Assembly; the Methodist the Conference. In the operation of congregational machinery the minister according to the Methodist practice is leader, judge and ruler—a shadow of a bishop. He presides at all meetings, nominates and exercises powers which appear autocratic. According to Presbyterian practice the minister moderates and has no special authority, being but leading elder.

(My Note:—See section on the elder, in this Chapter; also note criticisms of many of the points in this paragraph, given in the analysis, which follows the two letters of my correspondent).

"It is convenient to note here that the Congregational and Presbyterian systems are more akin in principle. They are democratic in origin and government. The Congregational Association has less authority than the Presbytery over the individual charge. Really the local charge is the Congregational Unit; the Presbytery the Presbyterian and the Conference the Methodist. I suppose the Bishop is the Episcopal. The position of the minister in the Congregational is almost that of *primus inter pares;* the Presbyterian a little more authoritative. The former is called, retained or released by the congregation and is subject to their discipline. The Presbyterian places the minister under the Presbytery and Presbytery controls the pastoral tie. The Methodist minister is subject to Conference and is sent by Conference to the Congregation—a step nearer Episcopal appointment and control. The Methodist is Episcopal and autocratic. This last remark applies rather to the Methodist Episcopal tradition than to the Wesleyan."

(My Note:—This paragraph lends itself to the following objections:

(1) The Congregational and Presbyterian systems differ widely in that there is absolutely no independency in Presbyterianism. The whole system is unified, although in practice the Presbyterian congregation has considerable autonomy.

(2) The Presbyterian system was not democratic in origin. There was no democracy in the time of the Stuarts. The principle of democracy has been evolved in Presbyterianism.

(3) The Bishop is the Unit in the Episcopal system, but there can be no Bishop without a Diocese. Hence many hold that the Diocese, the seat of the Bishop, is the Unit.

(4) The Presbyterian minister is not a little more authoritative than *primus inter pares.* There is absolutely no superiority of ministry over eldership. They simply exercise different spiritual functions, and are equal in authority in their respective offices under the Headship of Christ).

Letter No. 2.

This second letter from the same correspondent is dated Jan. 2, 1923, and reads thus: "You ask what are the sources of the Polity in the Basis. The Committee at its first meeting decided to prepare a summary of the polities of the three negotiating churches, setting forth the powers and duties of each church court. These summaries were taken from the Methodist Book of Discipline, the Presbyterian Book of Forms and Congregational sources.

"In the previous letter I told what happened after the second report. The memorandum, that was submitted and in the main adopted, was drafted largely with the Presbyterian Polity as an outline of Government, but in it several notable features of the Methodist Polity were incorporated, such as the Quarterly Board; the powers of the Conference with regard to the retaining and stationing of ministers; and the less frequent meeting of the General Conference, thus making it a legislative rather than an administrative body. The Session and the importance of Presbytery and the Barrier Act of the Presbyterian Church were incorporated. (My Note:—The writer observes that the two former were greatly modified. See Presbyterian Losses, Chapter III, E, III). "One notable difference from the Presbyterian system was the election of members of the General Council or Assembly by the Conference rather than the Presbytery. From an examination of the Polities of the three churches you can easily determine what has been taken from each.

"Your fifth question with regard to denominational gains or losses is rather difficult to answer:

(My Note:—Quite true: because, if union is consummated, time alone will tell whether the compromise system of polity in the basis is workable, at all, and to what degree).

"The Barrier Act has always been a very democratic weapon in the Presbyterian Church. The powers of Presbytery are less in the United Church than in the Presbyterian with regard to ordination of ministers and their settlement. Conference has been the influential court in the Methodist Church, and in the United Church it is far more important than is the Synod in the Presbyterian Church. There it controls the ministers and their setttlement, and there is also an increase of administrative duties partly discharged by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. The Synod of the Maritime Provinces in the Presbyterian Church approaches nearer to the Conference of the United Church than any other Synod. The freedom of the local charge in the Basis of Union with regard to practices, etc., is thoroughly Congregational.

"I do not see any serious difficulties in the working out of the Polity. Nothing has been incorporated in it that has not stood the test of successful practice in one of the existing churches. There is very little in the new Polity that has been left unsettled, but provision has been made for the necessary changes that time will demand. Of course before a new Polity can operate the territory of the United Church must be divided so that Presbytery and Conferences will be able to function."

(MY NOTE:—I hold, to the contrary, that "the fact that nothing has been incorporated in the polity of union that has not stood the test of successful practice in one or other of the negotiating churches," is *not* a guarantee that when these diverse elements of polity are thrown together they will coalesce. Moreover I hope that "the necessary changes that time will demand" to make workable the so-called "very little in the new polity left unsettled," will not involve such serious difficulties as to bring about divisions in the new church. This, I fear, will be the result in regard to doctrine, which with the polity, is now made an integral part of the Proposed Enabling Act. To change either, a new Act will be required. The whole business of referring our ecclesiastical constitution to Parliament for ratification, is, in the judgment of the writer, a most reactionary measure. It would lead to conditions from which it took our forefathers generations to unshackle themselves and the church of Jesus Christ and thus to gain their freedom from Crown and State dictation, and interference. Are our legislators to become "the popes of the church?" God forbid. To confirm church constitutions by law, is to invoke the dead hand of the past, at the expense of spiritual, intellectual, and civil liberty and progress).

C. *Diversity of Views as to the Polity in the Basis*:

Here, as in other phases of the church union movement, we find a wide difference of estimate as to the essence of the polity of the basis. A few examples of this diversity must suffice:

President W. C. Murray, University of Saskatchewan, an ardent unionist, and one of the leaders responsible for the section on Polity—writes in a booklet entitled *"Church Union an Opportunity and a Duty"*, by a Group of Presbyterians,* as follows:

"The Polity or form of government proposed for the United Church observes two great principles—liberty and efficient co-operation. To existing congregations, when they enter the Union, the utmost liberty will be given in the management of their domestic affairs in so far as that is compatible with the exercise by the higher church courts of their powers and functions.

"Accordingly, existing charges will "be entitled to continue their organization and practices (including those practices relating to membership, church ordinances, Sunday Schools and Young Peoples' Societies) enjoyed by them at the time of Union, subject in general affairs to the legislation, principles and discipline of the United Church." The property rights of existing charges will not be affected without their consent.

"Efficient co-operation is secured by a system of government that preserves the essentials of Presbyterianism.

"All charges to be formed after the Union will have a Session, a Committee of Stewards and an Official Board. These names have been agreed upon. It is probable that the members of the Session will be called Elders. The Basis of Union speaks of them as "a body of men especially chosen and set apart or ordained," "to have oversight of the spiritual interests of the charge." The Stewards manage the financial affairs. The Official Board, which includes Session and Stewards, secures contributions for missionary and other purposes, makes representations concerning the pastoral relation to the Settlement Committee and selects representatives in full membership to Presbytery.

"The next Church court is to be called the Presbytery. It is composed of the ministers and the representatives of charges, and these representatives are to be equal in number to the ministers. Its duties are identical with those of the present Presbytery, except in the matter of the ordination and settlement of the minister. While the Presbytery will be informed, and will have the opportunity of reviewing and passing opinion upon all matters relating to the ordination and settlement of a minister, the final right of ordination and settlement rests with the next higher court, the Conference and its Settlement Committee.

---

*See Appendix XI, 6, (b).

"Conference, like the existing Synod, consists of all ministers and representatives of charges within bounds. Its duties and powers are similar to those of the Synod, except that upon the Conference rests the duty of striving to provide every charge with a pastor, and every effective pastor with a charge. This involves the reception, ordination and settlement of ministers. The settlement is effected through a Settlement Committee, which receives applications for settlement and consults ministers and congregations.

"The highest court of all, the General Council, meets every other year. Its powers and duties are not only in reality similar to those of the General Assembly, but are even expressed in similar language. That great guarantee of Presbyterian liberty, the Barrier Act, is preserved. "The General Council shall have full power to legislate on matters respecting the doctrine, worship, membership and government of the church, subject to the condition that, before any rule or law relating to these matters can become a permanent law, it must receive the approval of a majority of the Presbyteries and, if advisable, of pastoral charges."

The above article, on The Polity of the Basis, by President W. C. Murray, was replied to by the late Rev. Dr. D. D. McLeod of Barrie, Ontario, in these words:

"In this paper, President Murray seeks to commend the polity of the basis as superior to our present system of Presbyterian Church Government,—like other advocates of Union. Because it is said there are defects in our present system of government, therefore we should instead of amending these defects, give up altogether our Presbyterian Church and adopt a new system of governing the Church. He says the new system of governing preserves the essentials of Presbyterianism, but in saying this he is mistaken and misleads his readers, for he immediately states:

1. That the final right of ordination and settlement rests with the Conference and its "Settlement Committee." It does not rest with the Presbytery as now. The Settlement Committee is placed over the Presbytery. The very basis of our Presbyterian system is taken away.

2. He tells us the settlement of ministers is effected through a Settlement Committee, which receives applications for settlement and consults ministers and congregations, and has the controlling power in settling ministers, so that under this new system of government, the liberty of congregations

is taken away. The liberty and power of Presbyteries is taken away; no pastor can know whether his pastorate will continue two years or more. The Settlement Committee can remove him when it thinks his usefulness is gone, and send him somewhere else. The new arrangement does not say what the Settlement Committee is to do with him if the place they send him to refuses to receive him. But why say more?

It is undeniable that the new system is not Presbyterianism. The statement of President Murray that it preserves the essentials of Presbyterianism is contrary to fact. The Settlement Committee takes away the best features of our Presbyterianism.

And who constitutes the Settlement Committee? A few men, we do not know who they may be; we may easily guess how they will get that position. These are to have power over Congregations and Presbyteries. This Settlement Committee is a new device. In its hands is put power more arbitrary than that of a Bishop,—a power capable of being used against any minister, and from which he has no redress. The liberty of the people gained after long conflict, is taken away from them, and this sacrifice of our Presbyterian Government is made with the consent of those who are employed by the Church to maintain and defend the doctrine and government of the Presbyterian Church."

Principal Fraser, a Leader Against Union:

Dr. Fraser gives his judgment on "The Polity of the Basis" in the following words:

"The statement of "Polity" is practically Presbyterian. This was to be expected, for it involves less compromise. The Congregationalists of Canada have never followed the system of Independency and are not really more Congregational than either of the other negotiating churches. With all due deference to Presbytery, the congregations of the Presbyterian Church have practical autonomy, and the same is true, perhaps to a slightly lesser degree, of the Methodist congregations. Moreover, the Wesleyans of Canada follow the Presbyterian order of government as their colleagues in the United States follow the Episcopal. Evidently then to the satisfaction of all, the professed aim of the joint committee on the question of Polity has been realized, namely, to "provide substantial congregational freedom and at the same time secure the benefits of the strong connexional tie and co-operative efficiency."*

A very distinguished Professor:

"I am much more interested in the substance and spirit of the church's life than the ecclesiastical order or ritual; though I am a Presbyterian by conviction not by birth, and I regard its government as, on the whole, the most reasonable. In this country owing to practical exigencies it has had to make radical changes.

"Any basis of the kind must be a compromise with the spirit of "give and take," and no party desires to sacrifice what it considers essential.

"Congregationalism must sacrifice most, as in the form of the old "Independency" it laid great stress on the autonomy of the individual congregation. That, however, has been modified to some extent by the formation of associations and unions.

"With regard to Methodism it was already in a Presbyterian "Connexional" system, and its administration more centralized and rigid than the Presbyterian church, though we have moved too rapidly in that connection. If union is consummated, I think there will have to be some decentralization and the setting up of Provincial centres instead of a great bureaucracy in Toronto."

Principal of a Presbyterian College, to the contrary, states:—

"There is no danger of overhead authority in the United Church because:

(1) The spirit of Canadian people is against centralized authority.

(2) Canadian Presbyterians to-day have an undue fear of Presbyterian Officials."

Prominent Hamilton Divine:

"The Polity is largely Presbyterian. It guarantees a democratic presbytery. For example: the Presbytery now consents to the settlement of a minister. In the United Church

---

**Harvard Theological Review,* July 1915.

the Settlement Committee will do this, but the congregation may call the man, and the Settlement Committee would not dare to run counter to the wishes of the people—though they must oppose absolute Congregationalism. There might be only one-third of the "stationing," now in vogue with Methodists, in the United Church."

A prominent Toronto Minister:

"The Polity is purely Methodist. The Presbyterian tinge is so faint that we may accurately assert that it does not display or contain the true significance of Presbyterianism."

An able town Minister:

"The Polity like the Doctrine of the Basis is a sandpapering of the striking denominational principles with a view to Union. My main criticism of the Polity of the Basis is that it is an impractical compromise of the two principles of Free Choice on the part of the congregation and that of the Settlement Committee. They cannot blend. One principle must be predominant, free and untramelled."

A scholarly Toronto Minister declares:

"The Polity in the Basis of Union is not Presbyterian in the Presbyterian sense. It is more or less democratic in a Methodist sense."

These examples selected from many utterances are sufficient to show that any attempt to state Presbyterian losses or gains in union polity is difficult. However the attempt must be made.

D. *Presbyterian Gains in Polity*:

This has been adequately set forth in the foregoing paragraphs which claim gains, as well as in Chapter III. E. III. As for Methodist and Congregational advantages or disadvantages they, too, are sufficiently indicated in Chapter III. E. I, and II. Moreover as the opposition to union in any organized form is found only in the Presbyterian Church our main business is naturally to ask:—

E. What then are the *Presbyterian Losses in Polity?* They are claimed to be:

(1) A new system of government not Presbyterian is

substituted by the organic union proposal instead of amending any defects in the present Presbyterian system.

(2) The Settlement Committee is placed over the Presbytery. Thus the very basal unity of Presbyterianism is weakened if not destroyed, and is a direct infringement of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church. For example:

If union is consummated, it will deprive congregations of the right and liberty of choosing their own minister. This right, liberty and privilege which is theirs to-day will be theirs no longer. That right will be vested in a Settlement Committee who will be appointed by the general conference to send what minister they please to you.

At present, if a congregation is vacant, the Presbytery, composed of neighbouring ministers and elders, all in close and sympathetic relationship, can proceed with a call whenever requested; the congregation can extend a call when ready, and need not do so until ready; the minister called can accept if he sees it to be a duty; and the Presbytery can induct him at any time convenient to all parties.

There is no other system of church polity in the world at once so simple and safe, with so little of opportunity for improper influence of any kind, and so worthy a free people who think and judge and act for themselves in things religious, instead of depending upon others to think and judge and act for them.

The securing of these rights has been a centre of conflict in the long struggle for religious freedom, whose victories we to-day enjoy.

Further, this training in freedom and self-government, has helped to make Presbyterianism one of the factors in securing the world's civil as well as its religious liberties.

In the proposed Basis of Union the settlement of ministers is taken away from the Presbytery and vested in the Settlement Committee of the Conference (or Synod) which shall decide all applications of ministers or charges within its jurisdiction.

To this Settlement Committee, which shall meet only once a year, any minister or pastoral charge, that would like a change, may apply, and the Committee may grant a change or not as it sees fit, or may make a different change from that asked for.

It is true that all applications from ministers and congregations are sent to the Settlement Committee "through the Presbytery" but the Presbytery has no power, except simply to forward such applications.

It is also true that the Settlement Committee shall comply "as far as possible" with the wishes of ministers and charges, but this provision only goes to show that the Settlement Committee has full power, and is the only judge of how far it is possible to comply with these wishes.

Further, not only is this Committee always open to applications for change, but it has authority, regardless altogether of Presbytery or any other, to initiate correspondence with either ministers or congregations with a view to a change. Practically the whole tenure of the pastorate throughout the whole church would be at its bidding.

Further, this Committee is supreme in its jurisdiction even of the Conference. For it "shall report to the Conference for information only." (My note:—This was a direct concession to Methodist Polity. See *Methodist Book of Discipline,* Chapter VI, p. 83).

"Even the Conference has no legislative or controlling power. The relation of the Presbytery to the charges within its bounds drops completely out of sight. If people wished to exchange the Presbyterian system of calling and settling ministers directly by the congregation concerned and under the control and jurisdiction of the Presbytery, for this system of the Methodist Church, it is their privilege to do so. But let us be done with the farce of calling such a system "Presbyterian" in any sense of the term. It is a system that gives arbitrary power to a group of men, that interferes with the rights and liberties of congregations and ministers.

Some Results Under the Settlement Committee:

(1) "Such a system would create universal unrest. With the minister there would be ever present the thought that at any year's end some of the congregation might wish a change and have it asked for. With the congregation would be this

question: Will the minister have his application for a change before the next meeting of the Settlement Committee.

The very fact of such a standing invitation to change, authorized by the Church, would make impossible the ideal tie between pastor and people, that strong and tender family tie, which is so precious a thing in a true pastor's life and so great a factor in his work.

(2) Many changes would be asked for which would not be made. A minister, in an hour of depression, might send an application which, later, would be withdrawn; or the Settlement Committee might decline to grant it. A congregation, for some cause might consider—or make—an application, and later withdraw it; or the Committee might not grant the request.

Such cases would injure the work. If a congregation finds that its minister has asked for a change, the tie can never be what it was before. On the other hand the knowledge that a congregation had asked for a change or even considered doing so, would take the heart out of any ministry.

(3) There would be a great increase in the number of changes, many of them needless and hurtful to the church. A minister in some difficulty, which should be bravely and trustfully faced, would take a step which he might, too late, regret. A congregation might seek and secure a change for which they would be sorry. The very presence of the standing invitation to apply for a change would lead to hasty separations, with consequent injury, where a brave and loving effort to meet the situation would have led to better things.

(4) If a minister should, from any cause, wish to make a change shortly after the Annual Meeting of the Settlement Committee, he could not do so, no matter how greatly another charge might desire his services.

(5) If a congregation should become vacant soon after the Annual Meeting of the Settlement Committee, no matter how united that congregation might be in its desire to call some minister, and no matter how willing he might be to accept, they would have to wait for the year, till the next Annual Meeting of the Settlement Committee, and accept,

for part or all of that year, such supply as Presbytery might be able to send.

There would thus, in a church as large as ours, be every year, a number of strong congregations, united in their desire to call, who would have a vacancy well on to a year in length, which, under our present system would only last long enough to waken the members to a sense of their responsibility, and give them a fresh start.

But the vacancy might not even then take end. In many of the applications for change, there would certainly be requests from more than one congregation for the same minister and the congregation or minister that could bring the greatest influence to bear upon the Committee would succeed. What of the unsuccessful? If not ready with another choice, the Settlement Committee would appoint a minister, for the year, unasked, perhaps undesired, and the congregation would be denied for another year the privilege of choice.

The Methodist itinerancy or the Anglican Bishopric is greatly perferable to the Settlement Committee in this regard. In the former a minister is appointed for a term of years, and there is no uncertainty.

It is indeed difficult to conceive of any other method more fitted to foster uncertainty and suspense, or which would lead to more frequent change than the Settlement Committee in the Basis of Union.

(6) One of the worst results of its adoption would be the inevitable "influence" of which it would be the centre.

Visit in fancy the Annual Meeting of the Settlement Committee, to decide all applications and calls accumulated during the year throughout a whole Synod. Its members, appointed by the Conference (Synod) are there, clothed with power supreme, and thronged with suppliants for favour.

Many of the ministers who have applied for a change are present, their high commission, as messengers of heaven, forgotten; interviewing as they have opportunity, the members of the Committee. From every congregation asking for a change, there are the two authorized representatives, and perhaps other voluntary ones, and all are at work, each seeking to advance his own cause.

Outside influences, far-reaching, are brought to bear; friendships, relationships, social interests, business interests, political interests, favours bestowed in the past or expected or promised in the future.

To accept the Settlement Committee of the proposed Basis of Union in exchange for the freedom and independence of our Presbyterian System, would be turning backwards from light and liberty to a yoke of ecclesiastical authority which few Presbyterians would accept if they realized its meaning."*

(3) The name Presbytery is retained, but the Presbytery as Presbyterians know it is no more.

(1) *The Presbytery in The Presbyterian Church.*

"Composed of the minister and an elder from each congregation within a given district, all chosen directly by the people, it is one of the chief features of our Presbyterian System. Looking out in one direction, it has supervision of the calling, examination, ordination, and settlement of ministers, not in any way of interference with the free choice of people or of ministers but in guarding the interests of both, and in taking care that everything in connection with the call is open and regular.

Looking out in the other direction, it chooses the Commissioners to Assembly, the highest Court of the Church. The Presbytery is thus the pivot upon which turns the long tried and proved machinery of our church government. It is government of the people, for the people, by the people.

(2) *The New Presbytery in The Basis of Union.*

In appointment of ministers, everything is taken from the Presbytery to the Settlement Committee, a body, for the most part at a distance, meeting once a year. To understand the loss to the Presbytery as well as to congregations, see notes on "The Settlement Committee" above.

Looking out in the other direction, there is also loss. At present the Presbyteries choose their Commissioners to Assembly chiefly by rotation. Each one has his opportunity.

In the proposed Basis all these rights are transferred to the Conference (Synod). Rotation would be impracticable. The more prominent ministers and elders would be appointed year after year. The less prominent would seldom see the Assembly or enjoy its benefits. This "Passing of the Presbytery" would mean the passing, in a large measure, of the people's rights and the centralizing of control, a going back to clerical authority instead of forward to popular liberty and responsibility.

---

*Presbyterian Literature.

It is claimed that affairs can be better managed by the better qualified few, than by the many. This has been the argument of autocrats through all history. It is the assumption which the Allies fought in the great war. The Presbyterian System assumes that every member is fitted for self government, in Church as in State, and aims to train them for that end.

What is to be the relation of the Presbytery to the Settlement Committee? How is a question of possible conflict in jurisdiction to be settled? If the Settlement Committee appoint a man to a charge of whom the Presbytery cannot approve, what is to be done?

If the Settlement Committee make an appointment that may be unsatisfactory to either minister or people, to whom may either appeal for redress? One of the most tenderly cherished Presbyterian principles is the right of appeal, how is this to be preserved in many similar cases?"*

"Then at present it is your privilege to have the minister of your choice settled over you by being ordained to the ministry and inducted to the pastoral charge to which he has been called. In the "United Church" the annual conference will do that for you. This is Methodist Polity. The man may be ordained by the annual conference of Halifax and sent to you from that point. One of the things Methodist ministers have admired and wished for was just such a solemn service as we have. The whole thing smacks of Methodism more than Presbyterianism." (cf. IV. 22 (5) Basis of Union, Appendix V).

"The laying on of hands in the Presbyterian Church is by the ministry of the church, just as in the Anglican Church through Bishops, that is to say, the Church ordains as the instrument of God. It is hard for Methodists to appreciate our deep conviction and pride in this profoundly spiritual conception, for Wesley says and the Methodist church after him, as do also the Baptists and the Congregationalists, "*I* will ordain." Presbyterians must never yield this sacred and precious principle."

---

*Presbyterian Literature.

Ordination of the Presbyterian ministry, by the Church, by the laying on of hands and through the exercise of the spiritual agency of prayer, is, according to historic Presbyterianism, no mere mechanical affair, but the means by which a regular spiritual succession of the ministry is perpetuated. Congregations cannot of themselves ordain a man to the ministry; nor can they do so by the assistance of a few friends, as in the Congregational Churches. Presbyterians repudiate that. They claim a succession as real as in the Anglican or Roman Catholic Church; for the power of Ordination rests with a group of Presbytery "orderly constituted." This is not Congregational doctrine. It is not Methodist practice. As a matter of fact, the Methodists have no "Succession." The line was broken by Wesley. Presbyterian Ordination is akin to the Anglican, as being the function of the Church through its duly qualified officers. Pure Presbyterianism really regards it as a quasi Sacrament.*

The basis of union sacrifices it, and therefore denies to historic and catholic Presbyterianism this lofty spiritual heritage.

Moreover the basis of union on this point is inadequate for future negotiations, with a view to a larger union, that would include Anglicans. Because it does not provide for, or demand, a mutual commission that would recognize whatever powers in this regard are found in other Churches of Christ, so that there may be a give and take, in order that the whole body of ministers might have all the authority, that individual ministers now possess in the several Churches. That is to say the basis of union overlooks the hiatus of re-ordination. If there is no mutual recognition of Holy Orders, how can there be any union?

It is also convenient to note that the method of choosing lay members to Presbytery is left unsettled (cf. III. 19, (2) of Basis, Appendix V).

---

*cf. *Manual of Ch. Doctrine,* Wotherspoon & Kirkpatrick, pp. 169 ff.

Further the right of members of Presbytery to be also members of Conference (Synod, we call it) is seriously affected. Some non-ministerial representatives need not be members of the Presbytery. It is open to discriminate against some charges, by choosing men from other charges who are not on the roll of the Presbytery. (20. (10) Ibid).

The basis of union apparently takes from Presbytery its right of discipline relative to the ministry. In the polity of the Basis, II. B. Sec. 15, (2), it assigns to the "session" the oversight of "the conduct of members, with power to exercise discipline." But in III, 20 (11), it assigns to Presbytery the duty "to have the oversight of the conduct of ministers within its bounds." Nothing is said of discipline. At present in the Presbyterian Church, the minister is a member of Presbytery and not of the congregation, as in Congregationalism. The Presbytery can ordain and depose. The deposed has the right of appeal to higher courts. In the Basis of Union the Conference alone has the power to ordain, and therefore logically to depose. The implication follows that in the matter of discipline, the minister will be sent on to the Conference. This is another clear concession to Methodist Polity.*

(3) *The Elder's Farewell*:

"In the Presbyterian Church, the ruling Elder, chosen by the people, is solemnly set apart by ordination to his sacred office, in the same manner as the ministry. In the proposed new "Session" of the Basis of Union, there is no mention of ordination; no provision for it; the office of ordained ruling elder has no place. A unionist writer says "It is probable" that the members of session will be called elders. "Probable"!

So far as that Basis is concerned, the member of Session is to be simply chosen as a member of any Committee might be chosen, for a longer or shorter time, under rules yet to be framed by the proposed Church."†

Despite the fact that the Elder as the permanent representative of the people, has historically stood for the rights of the people against clerical tyranny, his status is lowered.

---

*See *Methodist Book of Discipline*, pp. 149 ff.

†*Presbyterian Literature;* See also Polity II, B. 13 and 14.

The Session it is claimed is retained? But how is it constituted? See Sec. II. B. 9, in Basis of Union. (Appendix V).

(1) Two ways are mentioned by which lay members are to be chosen. They are to be set apart or ordained. This means confusion, for the two phrases do not mean the same thing.

Further in Sec. II. B. 14, we find that the rules regarding the lay members of the so-called Session are yet to be passed by the General Council. Clearly here we have no guarantee of the Eldership as we understand it. And the Eldership is the very Basis of the Session and of Presbyterianism. Further there is confusion regarding the duties of the Session with reference to admitting members into the church. Par. 15, (A), gives this body the power but cf. Par. 11, (a), "Admission to full membership, and granting of certificate of removal shall be by the action of the Session, and by the action of those in full membership, where desired by the Pastoral charge." Whatever this hybrid scheme may mean at least it is not Presbyterian.

(2) Then as to membership. Par. 11, (a), The members of the church entitled to all church privileges are those who on a profession of their faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him have been received into full membership. The children of such persons, and all baptized children are members of the church. Here is surrendered at once the standard of the Presbyterian Church regarding membership, and all distinction abandoned between the children of professing members of the church and of parents who have made no profession, so far as baptism is concerned.

4. The Quarterly Board as existing in the Methodist Church is introduced. (See B. 13). The experience of the Presbyterian Church has not shown any need of this body. It is cumbersome and unnecessary. Further note that lay representation to the next higher court, the Presbytery so-called are chosen by this Quarterly Board or Official Board, B. 17 (2), not by the Session. So that the lay representative need not be an elder, or even a member of Session. Is this Presbyterian? Further, it is not the Session, but this mixed Board that has access to the Presbytery. This opens wide the

door for all kinds of things that are wisely checked by our Presbyterian System of access to Presbytery through the Session.

5. The Conference System of the Methodist Church carried over bodily into the basis of union is a further loss. In addition to illustrations given above, cf. The Ministry Sec. I. 8, (Appendix V).

Here is another Committee with wide powers controlling the transfer of ministers from one Conference to another. This again interferes with the rights of Presbyteries, Congregations and ministers. At present in our church a congregation has the right to call any minister within the bounds of the church and any minister has a right under Presbyterial sanction of the call to accept it. But in this system, even the Settlement Committee is limited by the bounds of its own Conference and before men can be transferred from a charge in one Conference to a charge in another there must be some one who can be transferred in return. In other words it is the Conference that controls its men not the Presbyteries. This is a system that would be found both vexatious and irritating to Presbyterians accustomed to the wide liberty they now enjoy.

6. The present unit of the Presbyterian Church is the Presbytery. Some ultra high Presbyterians claim it is the Assembly. The basis of union makes the pastoral local charge the unit. See Polity I, 2. Here again we have a surrender of Presbyterianism to Congregationalism.

7. The Barrier Act of the Presbyterian Church is retained in the basis of union; but if it is used as loosely in the united church as it has been by the Presbyterian Assembly to promote union, rather than to interpret the constitution within the bounds of the Presbyterian Church, then it will be a very meagre "bulwark" against hasty legislation and unwarrantable changes in doctrine and government. It may result in a new constitution for the United Church, as it has already done in that portion of the Presbyterian Church willing to enter the proposed union.*

8. The Presbyterian Church has always claimed that both

---

*See Section on Barrier Act, below.

its doctrine and its polity were a matter of conscience and principle. In the past conscience was a word of power and meaning in our church. Men of the Presbyterian faith did not hold their principles so lightly that any compromise would satisfy them. We claim the express sanction of God's word for our Polity. The elders and ministers of our church at their ordination are asked to profess their belief that the government of this church by Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies is founded on and agreeable to the Word of God. And that they will pledge themselves to maintain and defend the same. But the Methodist Church makes no such claims for its polity. It is admittedly one of expediency only, and as such should be in an inferior position to ours. At least if it comes to a matter of conscience there can be no comparison between the two. Men who have taken seriously their ordination vow ought not lightly to abandon what they promised to maintain. Or as a keen organizer against Union has said:—

"If the polity is Presbyterian in the Basis, will some one tell us what the Methodist Church has abandoned of its present polity? The Methodists do not think they are being asked to make any radical change. The Presbyterians, on the other hand, are being told that the polity is Presbyterian and that nothing essential is lost. Now the absurdity of such a claim is apparent. The Polity cannot be both Methodist and Presbyterian. As a matter of fact the present Methodist system of Polity is practically unchanged but with a few good Presbyterian terms attached to some parts of the machinery. And it is the polity that counts. So far as the doctrine in the Basis is concerned, it matters little what it contains, since the minister is not asked to accept it or subscribe to it, but is given practically a free hand. It follows logically that the Basis of Doctrine is evidently for ornament only, not for use, lest some one more sensitive than our Presbyterian leaders might be offended."

9. The Methodist Church is a legally incorporated body, whereas the Presbyterian Church as a body is a voluntary society. Naturally an Incorporated church has more autocratic power and control than a voluntary one. The latter

is more given to checking up and questioning executive control, particularly so in regard to property rights, trust funds, etc. The basis of union calls for an Incorporated Church.

So as we trace the polity of the basis from step to step, we find that many fundamental principles of Presbyterianism are abandoned. From the Session up through all the Courts, very much that is "distinctively" Presbyterian is given up, in order to make organic union possible. Can the sacrifice be justified?

From all that has been said in this chapter on Polity, it will easily be seen that the introduction to the Polity, in the Basis of Union, is of no scientific value; but reads well as a begging of the question in the interests of the Union proposal.*

General Assembly, Presbytery, and Peoples' Rights.

The General Assembly "is the highest judicatory of the Presbyterian Church. It represents in one body all the particular churches of this denomination."†

Some high church Presbyterians claim the Assembly is the Unit of the Presbyterian system, and not the Presbytery. The Assembly was the first body, dating from 1560 in Scotland, whereas Presbyteries date from 1582. The Assembly constituted the Presbyteries. But as time went on, and the system was gradually worked out, the rights of the governing body, called the Assembly, were limited, in order to avoid the dangers of inexperience. Thus it is claimed that the Authority does not start from, nor rest with, the people but with the church as constituted. The Assembly, according to this view, is the primary and ultimate authority of the Presbyterian Church. In support of this contention one might quote such a statement as this:— "There can be no doubt that the Reformed Church of Scotland in its first organization began with a General Assembly coming together spontaneously from all the churches converted, and adopting books of discipline which contained the principles of reconstruction for itself and all subordinate assemblies of Synod, Presbytery, and Session, as they were subsequently set off from time to time and governed by its paramount authority. The practical force of truth developed formation from above, and not from below or beside, and embodied itself in constitutional formulas which could not be sent down as overtures to the courts below."* It is further argued that the supremacy of the Assembly is guarded to-day, for example, by its having the power to review the action of lower courts. It is maintained that authority, whether legislative, judicial, or administrative rests with the Church as "orderly constituted." This claim implies that the authority of the Church is centralized in the Assembly as the Unit, graded downward, and not as a diffused principle of power reaching its climax in a Federal concentration at the top. It is said to have assigned certain authority to the lower courts. Sometimes it is by devolution. For example, the Synod, it is said, once had power to ordain, but this has devolved upon the Presbytery.

---

*See Introduction to Polity in Appendix V, below.

†Hodge, *What is Presbyterianism,* pp. 245 ff.

Those who contend that the Assembly is the real unit, assert that those who declare the Presbytery to be the real unit, are wrong, because their position is contrary to historic Presbyterianism. Moreover they argue that this error is grounded on the false assumption of the mere name Presbyterian as being derived from the word Presbytery as the unit of authority. Whereas, they argue, to the contrary, that the real place of authority was given to the Presbyter and not to the Presbytery; the Presbytery being a convenient intermediate step between the Session and the General Assembly. That is, the Presbytery is regarded as a convenient working Unit where you have no executive officer. They draw the distinction between the Presbyterian Assembly and the Methodist General Conference, by describing the former as a Unit of authority, and the latter as a Federation of Conferences.

I do not accept the aforesaid arguments as an accurate statement in regard to the Assembly's authority. They are greatly overstressed. While I agree that the Assembly is the highest court of the church, it is not so in the sense of its being the unit. The whole Presbyterian system is a unit, but in particular the Presbytery is the unit. You cannot say that in origin the Presbytery came from the Assembly or vice

---

*See *Church Government,* Alex. T. McGill, p. 515.

versa. The beginnings of our Presbyterian system were part and parcel of the chaos in the national life of Scotland. The Reformed Church of Scotland originated in its organization in the authority of the Great Council of Scotland.* The first Book of Discipline was drawn up by John Knox and a few ministers.† The second book of Discipline was agreed upon by the General Assembly and inserted in the Register of the Assembly 1581, and established by Law in 1592.

The great point to be observed is, that the Headship of Christ is the real unit of Presbyterianism. All offices and authority are from Christ, not from the General Assembly, nor from the people. Nothing stands between the individual conscience and the Headship of Christ. Hence the Presbyterian Government is by men ordained to spiritual office. The Reformers claimed and insisted on this as over against Papacy.

The Assembly is the Totality; the Presbytery is the Unit. The Presbytery is the lowest basis of organization that is a church. Historically, three ordained ministers are required to make a Presbytery and thereby to form a Church. A splendid example of this fact is the Basis of the Secession Church of Scotland in 1733. Ebenezer Erskine, Wm. Wilson, Alex. Moncrieff, and James Fisher protested against patronage and other intrusions. They constituted as a Presbytery, independent of the authority of the Assembly, but claiming "to hold communion with the true Presbyterian Covenanting Church of Scotland. Their historic succession was never denied. They thus constituted a Church, and made good their claim that the Presbytery itself is a Church, and the Unit of Presbyterianism. In the Episcopal Church you must have a Bishop for a Schism. He is the unit, because he is regarded as the living church. With us the Presbytery as the unit can perpetuate a church, since it has within it a unity and succession of Church and Ministry. The Secessionist leaders proved historically and put into practice the fact that the Presbytery can ordain, preach, and gather people. They rightly claimed the "Keys of Doctrine, Discipline and Government"

---

*See, *Compendium of the Laws of Scotland,* I B, Dis; Ch. Gov.
†See, Compendium, Ibid, Vol. I, p. 36.

through divine ordination.* Again by Act of General Assembly 1839, their claim of right was admitted by the reception of their successors of the Associate Synod.†

This is an important fact which the leaders of the proposed organic union in Canada, seem to have overlooked. They imagine that an Act of Parliament can proscribe the Presbyterian Church. It cannot. The Basis of Union, however, is deficient in that it makes the Presbytery but a shadow of reality, and among many other things transfers the power of ordination to the Conference.

Dr. Van Dyke says: "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one Divinely appointed Ministry is the Unity of the Church. What constitutes all those throughout the world who profess the true religion, the one Body of Christ? We answer that four things are essential to the organization and life of a particular church; and the same things are equally characteristic and efficient in the Holy Catholic Church, of which every particular church is the miniature and the type; (1) The Confession of Jesus Christ as the Son of God, the Saviour of men, and the Supreme Head of the Church. (2) A living ministry, called of God's Spirit, and ordained to their work, according to His appointment. (3) The faithful preaching of the Gospel. (4) The due administration of the Sacraments. This statement is but the analysis and expression in another form of what Paul teaches in the fourth Chapter of Ephesians, "There is one body, and one spirit." It is the indwelling power of the Spirit that makes and keeps the body one; but that oneness is wrought out and made visible by the acknowledgment and possession of One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism, and One Divinely given Ministry."‡ True Unity is therefore of the Spirit not of outward and organic form.

The General Assembly is representative of the Presbyterian Church in its official capacity. Each member is representative of all that have sent him up to the Assembly. He is the representative of the people. He is not a delegate.

***History of Secession Church,* Andrew Thomson, p. 72. See also Presbytery of Relief.

†*Minutes of Church of Scotland,* 1839.

‡*The Church, Her Ministry and Sacraments,* Van Dyke, pp. 55-6.

Therefore the Assembly so constituted has no need to refer matters to the people. There is nothing in the Constitution which demands a referendum. The Church Courts are not the Courts of the people, but the Courts of the Lord Jesus Christ. The people accept their ministers and elders, who go up to the Assembly subject only to the Headship of Christ. Thus we have the paradox of Presbyterianism which is on a basis of true equality and pure democracy, recognizing always the right of the people, passing over into a possible autocracy under the Sovereignty of Christ. If Presbyterian leaders become obsessed with any particular idea, they may drive it through the Assembly in the name of the Great Head of the Church, Who is above all earthly kings. The only appeal against violent autocracy in the Assembly, is to the Great White Throne. Savonarola used this immortal right, when on the verge of his death by martyrdom, he made his appeal from the Church Militant to the Church Triumphant. Oliver Cromwell, unheeded by the General Assembly at Edinburgh whose members claimed they represented Christ, cried out: "I beseech you in the bowels of Christ, think it possible that you may be mistaken."* Perhaps "the full-steam-ahead" leaders of Organic Union, will hear this same appeal at the next General Assembly.

Such an Appeal ought not to be necessary, if it can be shown that the Assembly has been in error in its having committed the church to the policy of organic union. Fortunately "subsequent Assemblies are free to change and reverse any measure, outside the constitution, that has been ill-advised, mistaken or disproved by the logic of events. The reproach of inconsistency, often cast upon the records of our highest judicatory, is unwarrantable, in view of the supreme discretion reposed in its nature. When moved, beyond the lines of organic law and boundaries of constitutional enactment, to confront dangers to truth and holiness, and to use untried weapons taken from adversaries in the combat, it is human to err even in the highest places of imperfectly sanctified humanity. Our General Assembly has inherited this admission, made at Westminster centuries ago. It is her

---

*Harrison's *Oliver Cromwell.*

glory instead of her defect, therefore, to stand corrected from year to year, although inconsistency in her transactions through all contingencies of the past is exceptional and rare indeed."[*]

Again, the powers of the Assembly are now balanced by a system of limitation and division of duties and powers through the other three courts of the church, e.g., Synod, Presbytery and Session. The Assembly acts by and with the consent of the majority of the Presbyteries of the Church.[†]

The Courts of the Church with division of functions are not the result of delegation of authority from the top to the bottom, but are the result of centuries of evolution in organization spiritually conceived under the Headship of Christ, as wise and expedient procedure. All power is from Christ.

THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE

All through the history of Presbyterianism the rights of the people have been implicitly or explicitly there. Time and space do not permit an elaboration of this point. Suffice it to mention: (1) the election of the minister by the people (See I Bk. Dis.). After forty days delay in calling a minister, the church could send a man. But not without the consent of the people, and his examination before ministers and elders at a leading place. This was as early as 1560.[‡] (2) The rights of the people were asserted against patronage. In *Baillie's Letters,* Vol. II, p. 459, a letter from Archibald Johnstone of Warriston, to Mr. Robt. Baillie, Dec. 25, 1639, reads thus: "It (right of the people to elect a minister without patronage) was not established by statutory acts of the Assembly, but the contrary was tolerated. It was not established by the laws of the country. It was not established by practice. All that can be said is that it was wished for and supplicated for, and so ought we to do even as much as they, and to complain of the abuse and supplicate superior powers." The Acts of Parliament and the rights of the Crown were the obstacles in the way of spiritual freedom. The right of the people was always there as a principle, but became finally effective in 1874, as it naturally did in the various Free Churches from the moment of their beginnings as constituted bodies.*

---

[*] See *Church Government* by Alex. T. McGill.

[†] See *Moncrieff on Church Government.*

[‡] See *Compendium of the Laws of the Ch. of Scotland,* Vol. I, p. 36.

Even at the time of the Westminster Assembly, when high and aristocratic ideas of the power and authority of ecclesiastical office-bearers and church courts were entertained, "It is certain that the leading Presbyterians of that period held the principle about the consultation and concurrence of the people; and that they ordinarily acted upon it in practice."†

I hold the office-bearers and courts of the Church in high respect and reverence; but I also cherish in my heart a warm place for the great principle of the rights of the people. I conceive this to be a fundamental principle of Presbyterianism that has come down to us. In the matter of the Church Union proposal I believe that it should apply now, as it did at the outset of the movement. We as church members are at present wholly free from State control. We rejoice in the religious and civil liberties of a christian and democratic country. What we have we ought to hold. Though there is no necessity to refer the union proposal to our people, from the point of view of ecclesiastical constitution, yet it is wise, just, and christian so to do. To ignore the people, will be 'to heap coals of fire upon our heads,' and to endanger the whole movement not only of organic union, but of spiritual unity in this Dominion of Canada.

The Barrier Act.

"The General Assembly, to provide against "any sudden alteration, or innovation, or other prejudice to the church, in either doctrine, or worship, or discipline, or government," passed an Act, 1697, ix., known as the Barrier Act, which requires that before the Assembly passes "any Acts which are to be binding rules and constitutions to the church," they shall be proposed as overtures to the Assembly, and, being passed by them as such, shall be remitted to the consideration of the Presbyteries, and their opinion and consent reported to

---

*See *Intern, Encly. on Patronage.*

†See *Cunningham's His. Theol.* Vol. I. p. 57.

the next Assembly, "who may then pass the same in Acts, if the more general opinion of the church, thus had, agree thereunto." This rule is also applied to any "Act rescisory of any standing Acts" (1736, viii.) and to any "Act which involves an essential alteration of the existing law or practice" (1848, xiv).

"The purpose and terms of the foregoing enactments are not applicable to the passing of Acts which only declare what the law of the Church is (and to this may be added that the Assembly alone is the interpreter of its laws), nor to making unimportant alterations in Acts or practice.

"The Assembly may immediately convert an overture into an Interim Act, when this is "necessary for carrying out more effectually the subsisting regulations or forms of the church" ((1848, xiv). In this case it is sent down as an "Overture and Interim Act," and continues in force till *next* Assembly.

"NOTE 1.—If it has been the law or practice of the Assembly to legislate irrespective of Presbyteries in any matter which it might have subjected to this Act, it could not change that practice without passing the proposal to do so through the Barrier Act; e.g., Determining the membership of the Assembly (Rep. 1893). In like manner, matters which have always been subject to the Barrier Act may be exempted from it only if the change is approved through that Act; e.g., Exempting the Act on the Induction of Ministers (1893).

"NOTE 2.—There is no power under this Act (to which the State was not a party) to change anything that enters into the constitution of the Church. Legislation by its means relative to "doctrine, worship, discipline, or government" *can only touch these things so far as they are not fixed by the constitution of the Church,* or by *special civil statue.* The Veto Act (1835, ix) illustrates this. It was enacted after regularly passing the Barrier Act, but was found to be *ultra vires* of the Assembly.

"NOTE 3.—The Barrier Act *is not part of the constitution of the Church.* It could be rescinded with consent of a majority of Presbyteries."*

**Digest of Church Laws,* W. Mair, pp. 60-2.

The Barrier Act in Relation to the Canadian Church Union Proposal:

Two years after the consummation of the Canadian Presbyterian Union of 1875, the Presbyterian Church adopted the Barrier Act to make provision for internal reforms in matters of doctrine, worship and government. In this way it followed the example of the Church of Scotland, which, as we have observed, adopted the Barrier Act in 1697, to prevent hasty innovations within the Church.

The late honoured Clerk of the General Assembly, Dr. Robert Campbell, an authority on Ecclesiastical Law writes: "One of the articles in the Basis of Union proposes to invest in a majority full power to legislate on matters respecting doctrine, worship, membership and government of the Church, under certain specified conditions, assuming that the identity of the Church would remain although everything that characterized it might be altered. Such a position is wholly indefensible, and it is not to be wondered at that thoughtful Presbyterians hesitated to approve of it. The "Barrier Act" of the Presbyterian Church in Canada limits the matters that can be dealt with in the way of making changes. It reads: "No prepared law or rule relative to matters of doctrine, discipline, government or worship shall become a permanent enactment until the same has been submitted to Presbyteries for consideration." The proviso has clearly reference only to the administration of the Church's doctrine, discipline and worship, and does not contemplate any change in them. It is only laws or rules relative to them that are alterable according to the Act,—the terms of subscription, for instance. This is evidently the position taken by the Presbyterian churches of Great Britain. Even when relaxing the obligation to adhere to certain portions of the Confession, they have been careful to leave the original text intact, when arranging terms of subscription and declaratory acts.

"The Barrier Act" being mentioned, it is of importance to consider how impossible it is that it could be meant to apply to any situation such as that created by the Union movement. Not only was it necessarily beyond the thought of those framing the constitution of the Presbyterian Church, or drafting the "Barrier Act" as an instrument for providing such changes in the method of administering the constitution as experience might require, to have in contemplation a complete transformation of the Church such as is now proposed; but inasmuch as the changes proposed affect other churches and are meant to affect them, it is manifest that the "Barrier Act" cannot be invoked as allowing the church to change its doctrine, its polity or its forms of worship. In short, it is impossible by constitutional means for a church to set aside its characteristic standards and yet retain its identity. This can be accomplished only by a revolution."

As Lord Davey said in giving judgment in the Free Church case: "The Barrier Act is a procedure act and not an enabling act." "Why then," says a non-organic-unionist, "should a so-called minority be accused of following a divisive course when they refuse to bow to the authority of a so-called majority that has exceeded its jurisdiction."

In a word the Barrier Act is a self-imposed constitution-check to prevent over-hasty legislation within the Presbyterian Church.

Finally, it is interesting to learn that the Barrier Act has been humorously, but accurately described as the "Barricade Act" against women, for by it only Presbyteries can vote, which are made up of ministers and elders and have no women members. Women, however, comprise the majority of the membership of the Presbyterian Church, and are thus deprived from voting for or against the union proposal. They are thereby denied their religious rights in a free country by the "Barricade Act."

CHAPTER VI.

The Question of Legal Obstacles in Union Proposal

THE subject with which this chapter is concerned is, I believe, fully covered by the report of the solicitors appointed to draft the proposed legislation. In the report which Mr. G. W. Mason, K.C., and Mr. MacGregor Young, K.C., made to the Committee on Law and Legislation, they set out at length and with some degree of detail the difficulties which they had faced and the methods adopted for overcoming these difficulties. The reader will find this report printed with the draft legislation in Appendix IX.

The Union Bill was accepted unanimously by the General Conference of The Methodist Church (1922), and is to come before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (1923). The unionists of the latter church have not officially objected to the Bill, but there are those among them who are advocating another vote of the people on the whole question, as the proposed Bill introduces a new element and creates a new situation, upon which the judgment of the Church has not had an opportunity to express itself. This together with the fact of strong organized opposition to organic union has caused certain unionists to deem it unwise "to go full steam ahead" towards the consummation of union.

On the other hand the Presbyterian Church Association, antagonistic to organic union, and their large following, are almost if not entirely unanimous in their condemnation of the Bill as "iniquitous legislation."

It is aside from the main purpose of my book to go afield into a discussion of the legal obstacles. But for the sake of a more comprehensive understanding of the union movement a brief statement seems to me to be necessary.

Some of the important matters calling for consideration owing to the legal position were as follows:—

1. The difficulty of defining what would pass to the

United Church upon consummation of union. The Methodist Church is an incorporated body, the Presbyterian Church in Canada is not incorporated but has been recognized as an entity in many Statutes of Parliament and the Provincial Legislatures. There is no such body as the Congregational Church of Canada as the Congregational churches are separate autonomous units. In both the Presbyterian and Congregational denominations many bodies have been incorporated for church purposes to administer properties and funds. This was found necessary because of there being no incorporation of the general body.

This difficulty was met by framing the definitions in section 2 of the draft Act in such a way as to carry all such incorporated bodies and all congregations in connection with or in communion with the various denominations into the United Church.

2. In Canada we have to contend with a situation which did not exist in Scotland. Ours being not a legislative union but a federal union it was necessary to consider the respective powers of Parliament and of the Provincial Legislatures. Certain of the property of the various denominations by reason of its being common to the whole denominational body throughout Canada or by reason of its origin is within the legislative control of Parliament. The property of the congregations and many properties held in trust for congregations or for denominational purposes and many college properties are subject to the Provincial jurisdiction.

To meet these conditions section 4 is designed to vest the general property in the United Church and section 5 is designed to deal with the property of congregations.

3. If the Parliament of Canada passes legislation uniting various bodies and the Legislatures of the Province pass the necessary legislation to give effect to the union in the various Provinces, no questions can arise such as arose in the Free Church case in Scotland. The Parliament and the Legislatures together have power to give full effect to the legislation. The task is to see that the legislation covers what is required to vest the properties of the uniting churches in the United Church free from any outstanding claims.

The intention of the draft legislation is to cover all questions that may arise as to property so that there will be no room for any action in the courts to restrain the transfer of any property to the United Church. Sections 9 and 10 of the Draft Act are designed to make "fair and equitable" provision for those members of uniting churches who are opposed to the consummation of union. "Section 9 embodies a provision made in the legislation uniting various Presbyterian churches in the year 1875 whereby a congregation not concurring in the union may vote itself *out* and retain its property." Section 10 contains certain provisions not contained in the legislation of 1875 and provides for the establishment of a Commission to allot to nonconcurring congregations such portions of the general property of the denomination to which they belong as the Commission may determine.

4. Another problem is the question as to the assumption by the United Church of debts of the uniting churches. At present the denomination as a whole is not responsible for the debts of individual congregations and in some cases individual congregations have incurred very large debts in the building of churches.

Section 11 provides that the United Church shall become liable for all debts of the negotiating churches except the indebtedness of individual congregations.

5. The colleges of the various denominations are governed by Boards and the property of the colleges is usually vested in these Boards. The denominations have usually no direct control over the colleges or college property but they usually have powers of nomination to the Boards and in some cases can control the appointment of professors. The denomination also may withhold financial support from a college, should it see fit. It may be that it will be necessary later to determine more accurately the relationship of the colleges to the United Church and that legislation will be necessary to deal with the disposition of college property.

The draft legislation does not attempt to change the present status of colleges but merely provides that such powers as are now vested in the governing bodies of the various negotiating churches shall vest in similar bodies connected with the United Church.

6. The constitution of some of the Presbyterian colleges provides that the teaching in the colleges shall be in accordance with Westminster Standards. In certain Methodist colleges the teaching must be in accordance with the principles laid down in John Wesley's Notes. The Basis of Union sets out the doctrines of the United Church. Assuming, for the purpose of argument, that these doctrines may contain departures from the provisions of the Westminster standards and of the Wesley standards, what is to be done?

Section 13 provides that notwithstanding anything that may be found in any source of authority respecting the principles, doctrines or religious standards to be taught in the colleges, the principles, doctrines and religious standards set out in the Basis of Union, or hereafter prescribed as in section 13 set out, shall be taught in the colleges. The teaching thereof shall not be deemed to be a breach of, but a compliance with, any previously existing requirements. The same principle is made to extend to trusts for the colleges.

7. There are many cases throughout Canada where properties are held upon certain trusts for denominational or congregational purposes and where the terms of the trusts restrict the use of property for the propagation of certain beliefs, etc. In the absence of any provision for such cases it might be contended that the use of such trust property for the benefit of the United Church would be a breach of the trust.

Section 14 provides that many such trusts shall continue to exist in connection with the United Church, the performance to be as nearly as possible for the same purposes or objects as contemplated by the donor.

A great many other matters arose in the consideration of the draft legislation but many of them were matters of administration rather than of law.

It is a fact, then, of vital importance that the proposed Organic Union cannot be accomplished without enabling legislation to overcome grave legal obstacles. These have also been set forth, and no doubt carefully studied by the solicitors who framed the proposed Act of Incorporation, in a masterful book entitled, "The Public Statues, relating to the Presbyterian Church in Canada, with the Acts and Resolutions of the General Assembly, and By-Laws for the Government of the Colleges and Schemes of the Church," by the late Hon. Thomas Wardlaw Taylor, Chief Justice of Manitoba, (second edition, Winnipeg: Hart and Company, Limited, 1897).

I have been led to believe that The Church of Scotland Act, 1921 (See Appendix X), gave the framers of the Canadian Act of Union the cue as to how to plan the Proposed Act with a view to carrying the United Church as a "legal entity" into Union. It was not, however, of much practical value as to meeting the details of the Canadian problem because of the difference in legislative system and because of the different issues involved.

It is probable that if the draft legislation is approved by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church it will be presented to Parliament before being submitted to the various Provincial Legislatures. If the various Church Assemblies approve of the legislature, the unionists claim that it would seem to be in accordance with precedent that Parliament and the Legislatures will give effect to the desire so expressed. But at present it can be a matter of opinion only as to what the attitude will be towards this particular legislation.

The view point of the non-unionists as to the draft Bill is well expressed by a member of the Presbyterian Church Association in the following letter (in which reference is made to the Rev. Dr. Pidgeon, Chairman of the Union Committee who has described the Bill as "excellent") :—

On The Union Bill.

To the Editors of *The Presbyterian Witness*:

Organic Union as an ecclesiastical project survives today. As a movement to express, in visible form, an inner spirit of unity, it is dead. A movement of this latter kind has no choice of weapons. It must rely wholly on the force of persuasion. When the promoters of organic union, finding themselves unable to carry the Presbyterian Church, as a spiritual entity, into union by the force of persuasion, propose to carry the Church as a "legal entity" into the union by the force of legislation, the whole spiritual implication of the movement has vanished. Instead of appealing once more to the people of the Church that they might record the light that has come to them through the lessons of the war, which action is clearly implied in the words of the "truce," it is proposed to approach Parliament with a bill unendorsed by the people, which contemplates the disintegration of a great Church in the name of union. Instead of approaching Parliament with a bill which embodies the desire of a united people, it is proposed to ask Parliament to endorse a bill which imposes the will of the so-called majority on a so-called minority and compels the minority to accept the majority's conception of the minority's rights. This conception of the majority denies certain morally inalienable rights to the minority and grants certain other inalienable rights, but in such calculated fashion that while the United Church will go on without ripple or ruffle the remaining Presbyterian Church is left in vacuo, without power to function and without right even to its own name.

The General Assembly gave instructions to the Union Committee to explore the whole union situation. The majority of the Union Committee proceeded immediately to exploit the situation. In the course of exploitation through counsel, they discovered the principle of the legal entity of a Church. This principle, as it is interpreted, makes it possible to evade by force of legislation, all the embarrassing features of the situation which justice says must be met, not evaded. In a word the bill which was to lay before the General Assembly all the facts of the situation is one which shows the Assembly how to escape all the embarrassing facts and moral obligations by legislation. It is reported that one of the legal gentlemen largely concerned in the preparation of the bill said inadvertently: "Frankly speaking, this bill is meant to kill off the die-hards." He did not need to say it. The bill shouts it.

One wonders what is Dr. Pidgeon's conception of the duty of a legislator. The legislator is as much bound as the judge to have regard to those rights asserted and protected in present law and endorsed by the common sense of justice resident in humanity. If we concede the legislator power to intervene where the interpretation or application of a law interferes with the clear intent of its spirit, it does not follow that he can arbitrarily suspend those laws which are effective in guarding undeniable rights and morally inalienable equities. Legislation must be justice, not usurpation and confiscation. It can never be right to deny rights nor equitable to deny equities. Dr. Pidgeon would deny equities in certain cases because it is convenient to do so, and in other cases because it would be paralysing to do so. Yet it is nothing less than paralysis that this bill designs for the remaining Presbyterian Church.

Dr. Pidgeon says that there are in the constituting instruments of some of the colleges very definite obligations as to standards of Church government and religious standards. This, he says, makes legislation necessary. Legislation necessary for what? To fulfil the obligation? No, legislation to abolish the obligation, which counsel states in memorandum has been departed from, and to alienate the property from those who still are loyal to Presbyterian standards of government and doctrine. Give this thing its right name. It is legislative and ecclesiastical Bolshevism.

Will not the legislature, true to its responsibilities, ask some questions? Will it not ask—Is this so-called majority a real majority? Eight years have passed since the last vote revealed a decreasing majority for union. Since that time thousands of members have passed away. Thousands of members have been added. Why not a new vote for the guidance of the legislature? Why hesitate when Dr. Pidgeon has said in an interview given to a Star representative that he believed the people would give an overwhelming vote in favor of proceeding to Union? This is his opportunity.

Will not the legislature, true to its responsibilities, also ask—Does this bill protect the rights of the minority? The rights of the minority are as sacred as the rights of the majority. Here again we challenge Dr. Pidgeon to submit this present bill to an impartial body who shall declare whether the provisions in this respect are just or fair.

Dr. Pidgeon should not only elucidate the principles of the bill, but should proceed to elucidate the New Theology that arises out of the principle of the legal entity of a Church and the unrestrained supremacy of legislation. There is a new conception of the religious liberty of the individual here. Consider the case of a man who last night was a Presbyterian, adhering to Presbyterian standards of doctrine, approving Presbyterian polity and attracted by Presbyterian traditions. He may waken one morning to find himself legislated into a Church whose doctrines he does not assent to, whose polity he does not approve, whose traditions he has not discovered. He still feels a Presbyterian. He should not feel so for he is not. Legislation says he is not. As a part of the "legal entity" he has been absorbed into the membership of a new Church. But it is said he can vote himself out. Out into what? Having separated himself by vote from the legal entity he has become a legal nonentity, for there is no Presbyterian Church remaining into which to vote himself. This bill in the name of Presbyterianism and Unity designedly seeks to compel him, like Noah's dove, to remain in the waste and void or return to the Ark of the United Church and its varied company. This is the tyrannous interference of the State with the religious liberties of the individual. No legislature exercising its high prerogatives with just restraint will pass this bill. No Church true to itself will ask it. It can only be passed by subjecting the legislator to those alien considerations and subtle intimidations and illegitimate pressures to which no church should seek to subject him.

In conclusion let me say that there seems only one course open if the so-called majority is determined to proceed to Union. Let a new vote be taken to determine what and where are the majority and minority. Let a bill be drawn up embodying a division of properties and moneys arrived at by mutual agreement or by decision of an impartial body. Let this bill be submitted to Parliament for sanction. Thus the church, self wounded like Brutus' wife, will at least, like Brutus' wife, conceal her wounds under the robe of a seemly spirit from the gaze of the curious, the scoffing and the exultant.

(Rev. Dr.) J. D. Cunningham.

Welland, Dec. 28, 1922.

Or again, we have the following brief digest of "The Church Union Bill":—

"There are certain things in this Bill which should be clearly understood and forcibly stated. This pamphlet is written for the sole purpose of letting every loyal Presbyterian know just what it would mean if this Bill becomes law.

The four main provisions of the Bill are plain and simple. They are as follows:—

(1) It seeks to create and incorporate by law an organization—to be called the United Church of Canada—with autocratic powers.

(2) It would hand over to this corporate body the entire Presbyterian Church in Canada.

(3) It would provide that, within six months, a congregation may vote itself out of this corporation.

(4) After a congregation has voted itself out, the Bill would provide a commission of nine, which would decide as to the rights of those voting themselves out in the general property and funds of the church.

Notice well what these provisions mean. Here are some things which they mean:—

(*a*) If this Bill becomes law, then the Presbyterian Church in Canada passes out of existence—her very name is abolished. Canada would be the only civilized country in which there is no Presbyterian Church.

(*b*) All the ministers and members, all the property and funds of the Presbyterian Church would, by law, become the property and form part of the United Church.

(*c*) This would mean coercion; for, many ministers and members of the Presbyterian Church would be compelled by law to become members and become subject to the discipline of an organization in which they do not believe and which they do not desire to join.

(*d*) A congregation must vote itself out within six months or ever after remain connected with the United Church. If a congregation does vote itself out—it is out in the cold with a vengeance; for there will be no Presbyterian Church in Canada with which to unite.

(*e*) Should a congregation, at a meeting, held within the six months decide, by a majority of one, to remain in the United Church then the minority must go out and have no equity in the property or funds of the congregation, *e.g.* If a congregation of 401 members voted as follows:—201 to stay in and 200 to go, the 200 have no claim on the property whatever, i.e., a bare majority of one at a meeting, where many through sickness and such like causes cannot attend, may create this crisis and perpetuate this injustice—from which there will be no appeal.

(*f*) This Bill, if it becomes law, will certainly create a serious disruption in the Presbyterian Church in Canada; for whether or not the advocates of union press this matter, whether or not this Bill becomes law; there will be a very large body of solid determined Presbyterian people who will absolutely refuse to be incorporated by law, against their will, into any such organization.

There are many other features of this Bill, which are as unfair and objectionable as those mentioned above. These however will suffice to show that Union at this time is out of the question. If Union can only be accomplished according to the terms of this Bill, then surely anyone, with a sense of justice, must conclude that Union should not now be consummated."

Montreal, Jan. 15, 1923.

CHAPTER VII.

The Kind of Church Union Canada Needs

THE writer began this study of the union movement over one year ago with an absolutely open mind. He knew not where the facts would lead him. With deep sincerity of purpose, and in an unbiased and judicial manner, he has sifted, arranged, and interpreted the knowledge gleaned. He feels that as a parting word, uttered in no spirit of bitterness, bold audacity or cringing fear, he must state honestly what he is convinced this study should teach us as to "The Kind of Church Union Canada Needs."

Let it be said most emphatically, that the facts presented in the aforesaid pages prove to him that the organic union of the three negotiating churches, is unnecessary, unwise, and impossible, because:

1. The logic of events as set forth in the history of the movement, does not warrant the consummation of the proposed organic union; but it does indicate the desirability, if not the necessity, of a statesmanlike scheme of co-operation, federation, confederation or the like. That is, the true call is for an alignment of Christian forces, not the merging of them.*

The history of the union movement has been too checkered for anyone, but a partisan, to pronounce judgment in favour of the "merger". From 1899 to 1903 no higher hope was entertained, by the three negotiating churches, than that of increased co-operation. The ideal of organic union was thrown into the arena of ecclesiastical politics, as we have seen, by the late Principal Patrick, in his unauthorized advocacy of it at the 1902 General Conference of the Methodist Church. From that day to this the Methodists have been anxious for union, and have favoured or entertained no other objective. They have preached it, written it, propaganded it, and finally, in 1922, unanimously adopted the proposed Act of Incorporation, apparently finding nothing unfair in it; whilst non-organic-unionists of the Presbyterian Church, who have always been strong in numbers, brains, spirituality, organization and wealth, have vehemently opposed union, and are now condemning the proposed legislation as an "iniquitious" and "immoral" attempt at legalizing the confiscation and spoliation of Presbyterian rights, persons, and possessions.

---

*See Chapter I, and II, B. (1)

Moreover this strong minority—(which no man can number without another vote, in the light of the new facts realized for the first time, now that the Bills of law are before the Church)—are determined to maintain their rights and to continue the Presbyterian Church; the continuance of which, if not permitted by the Proposed Act, will drive thousands of Presbyterians into the Anglican Church, and cause many others to drop out of church life altogether.

The very name "United Church of Canada," is a misleading misnomer. It implies the objective of a United Protestant Church of Canada. This was the ideal set forth in the momentous resolution of the Methodist General Conference of 1902, which officially initiated the organic union proposal. This ideal was shared by the fathers of organic union in all three churches; in fact, some of them hoped that even the Roman Church should ultimately be included, if within the possibility of Ecclesiastical politics. But curiously enough, owing to the quadrilateral terms laid down by the Anglicans as the condition of entering into negotiations, and the Baptist opposition to union, contained in the respective replies of these churches in the early years of the movement, the three negotiating churches have never since shown any official anxiety for a larger union than the narrow one now proposed, viz., that of the big Presbyterian and Methodist churches along with the small Congregational communion. Nor is there any likelihood or even seeming possibility of organic union with Anglicans or Baptists now or at any future date. At least we have not a scrap of official evidence to that effect.*

---

*See Chapter I. A and B.

Whilst the basis of union was being drawn up in the five years (1904-8), various suggestions had, from time to time, been sent forward by individuals or church courts; and these suggestions, whether transmitted through the denominational committees, or coming directly under the notice of the Joint Committee are said to have received due consideration. However, that may be, the surprising fact is obvious to any one, who investigates the union doctrine and polity, that the changes are slight and principally verbal.*

There is a monotonous repetition running through all the reports about "the spirit of utmost brotherliness." I do not personally object to such a beautiful sentiment; but naturally I should have been delighted to have found more definite official information as to what each denominational committee regarded as its specific doctrinal inheritance, etc., before the proposal for Union, then a statement from them indicating the general lines of discussion, which went on within the respective denominational Committees and also at their joint meetings, so that all the negotiating churches might have had a clearer conception, as to what were the real denominational losses and gains in the union proposal. I hope the reader of this book has found that my research work, herein set forth, has remedied this vital defect, and that at last we have the facts, upon which we are competent to make an intelligent estimate as to the basis of union, on the basis of facts not on presuppositions or catch-slogans of union or anti-union Propagandists.

Although the action of the General Assembly has always been overwhelmingly in favour of union, I am convinced that the Assembly has blindly followed a few leaders, who were obsessed with the one and only cure-all, e.g. organic union. If the history of the movement teaches us anything, it teaches this: that there has from the first been a determined, though somewhat covert human hankering after this particular kind of union, based on the flimsiest presuppositions and assumptions. Our representatives at the Assembly have shown either an inability to discern, or a partisanship to reject any other possible solution. The truth of this assertion is borne out by simply observing some of the facts of the movement's history,* as for example:

---

*See Chapter III. B, and Chapter V.

In 1906 The Assembly voted down an amendment in favour of federal or co-operative union, proposed by Presbyterians who claimed organic union was "not in the best interest of the Presbyterian Church in particular, nor of Christian life and work in Canada, in general."

In 1907 the Assembly refused to submit the whole question of union, and the desirability of organic union to the Church. Again the same Assembly rejected, as premature, an amendment, moved and seconded by UNIONISTS, to submit the whole question to Presbyteries, Sessions and Congregations for their judgment. The Church, it declared, had not as yet in its possession the materials for forming a judgment on the question before it.

With regard to this last statement I am at a loss to understand what seems to me the inconsistency of claiming the lack of materials for such a decision when the union Committee had repeatedly declared, during the years 1903 to 1907, that union was feasible and practicable, and that, too, before the basis of union had been completed, or the will of the people ascertained by vote.

In 1908 the opponents of organic union urged that there was unmistakable opposition to the further prosecution of the negotiations for organic union, but favoured co-operation to prevent overlapping. This, they claimed, would meet the crucial economic argument of the unionists. But the Assembly maintained organic union was practicable, and voted down an amendment to ask the people's will in the matter.

I wonder why the unionists who claim that the Union Movement is of the people, and that the General Assembly is thoroughly representative, did not accede to the request of those wishing to hear the voice of the people on the whole matter. Did the Assembly fear the vote of the people?

In 1909 the Assembly refused an amendment requesting that the judgment of the church be asked as to a choice between Federation or Organic Union. Why was this democratic privilege denied the people? Was this autocratic denial due to obsession for organic union, or to fear of the people's vote against it, or to both?

---

*For these facts see the Minutes of the General Assembly.

In 1910 a recommendation was rushed through the Assembly to the effect that the Basis of Union be approved and sent down to Presbyteries under the Barrier Act, an official step towards Union, and not to the people for their judgment, in the face of assurances to do so hitherto made. Organized opposition to Union resulted, and has ever since continued, and to-day is still formidable.

Two votes on organic union have been taken in the Presbyterian Church; the first in 1911 and the second in 1915.

The Assembly of 1912 decided that "in view of the extent of the minority" the movement should be halted, hoping for "practically unanimous action within a reasonable time."* The justice of that decision was never questioned.

The second vote gave an increased opposition of 23,000 communicant votes against union. Despite this fact the Winnipeg Assembly of 1916 astonished the Church by determining on the policy of Union. The Assembly appears to me to have been stampeded into breaking faith with its own people opposed to this kind of Union.

In 1917 the Montreal Assembly expressed sincere sympathy with the desire conveyed in many Overtures to it, to avoid disunion among the membership of the church, and to this end decided upon the discontinuance of propagandism for or against union, and called for a cultivation of a spirit of prayer, and urged that during the period of the war, and until the second Assembly after the close of the war, no further action be taken, but that the church await the growing experience of the people, and the lessons of the war.

In 1921, without seeking to find out the "new light received by Divine guidance"† by giving it a chance to shine through the ballots of the people, and the ballots of the more than 100,000 new members who have never had a chance to vote on the question, and through the ballots of thousands of Presbyterian soldiers overseas at the time of the second

---

*See *Minutes,* 1912.

†See 1917 *Minutes,* page 53.

vote, and despite the protest of the minority, the General Assembly resolved to consummate organic union as "expeditiously as possible." The term "as expeditiously as possible" was ambiguously discussed on the floor of the Assembly, and has since been interpreted by some as meaning "as quickly as possible," and by others as meaning "as cautiously as possible."

The 1922 Assembly adopted the Report of the Committee on Church Union.* This report contained the following vital clauses regarding proposed legislation:—

1. "That Counsel be instructed to prepare such draft bills as would be necessary to the consummation of Union with the Congregational and Methodist Churches, and which would give effect to the resolution of the General Assembly of 1921;

2. "That Counsel be instructed further to prepare such legislation as will conserve the rights and interests of all parties involved, in consonance with the memorandum of Counsel.

"These drafts, when completed, are to be submitted to your Committee for consideration, and then to the General Assembly of 1923 for consideration and decision. Your Committee is convinced that the only way in which the Church can become acquainted with all that is involved in the decision of 1921 is by having before it the actual measures required to put it into effect. Then when the church acts it will be with full and accurate knowledge of what the action means."

The obvious deduction from all this is, that no adequate mandate for organic union has ever been given the Assembly to proceed with it. No choice has ever been offered the Church as to any other possible solution. Moreover, the framing of definite legislation, in October 1922, to be introduced to the Federal Parliament and the various Provincial Legislatures constitutes an entirely new situation, which demands an authoritative mandate by the voice of the present membership of the Presbyterian Church, and all the more so since there is an intense criticism by Presbyterian non-organic unionists, of the method of the drawing up, as well as of the substance, of the Proposed Act of Incorporation.†

The writer is of the opinion that the Bills will not be passed by our Legislators without such a mandate, and that

---

*See 1922 *Minutes,* Appendix, pp. 508-512.

†See Chapter VI.

in its present form the proposed legislation is "unfair" if not "immoral."

Unionists who claim that the union movement is of the people, and is sweeping the whole country under the guidance of God, should not fear to trust a "divinely guided people" to express their judgment by ballot on the whole issue, now that the Church for the first time is beginning to realize what a momentous action organic union involves.

If organic union, with its objective as the expression in visible form of an inner spirit of unity, can be consummated, not by the force of persuasion, but only by the force of legislation, and that, without a mandate from the people, who have never voted upon the Proposed Act—an Act of Law planned to carry the Church as a "legal entity" into Union, then, I maintain, without fear of successful contradiction, that "the whole spiritual implication of the movement has vanished." If this enabling legislation is just, and does not as is charged against it, deprive Presbyterians opposed to organic union of their religious liberty, their properties and moneys, then it behooves reasonable unionists to let the people say by vote, what they interpret to be the meaning of the Proposed Act of Incorporation. It is incorrect to claim, as unionists do, that the Proposed Act is in all points included in the basis of union, voted on by the negotiating Churches.*

I am quite well aware that there is nothing in the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church to demand a referendum to the people. It must not be forgotten, however, that the General Assembly has twice submitted the question to the people, and the leaders of union, in the early years of the movement, held that it was the part of wisdom to consult the people. Here are a few examples, extracted from the files of the Toronto Globe:

Principal Patrick, at the Kingston Assembly, 1905, said:

"The question was not for the ministers and elders only, but for the people, and they wanted to carry all the members of the three churches into the union."

At the London Assembly, 1906, *Dr. Patrick* said:

"From first to last the question must be a people's question—

---

*Compare Proposed Act of Incorporation with Basis of Union, and observe vital differences.

at this stage it was their duty to inform and teach the people. They were not expecting a judgment even from the Assembly."

Rev. Dr. Armstrong declared:

"The tide of democracy had set in, and the people would assert their view on the matter."

Rev. Dr. Falconer (now *Sir Robert*) stated at the same Assembly 1906:

"It was their duty to prove if union was feasible. From the commencement he had put it in the forefront, that it would be utter madness to go forward to a union that did not carry the whole church with it. It was absurd to think that the Assembly could force its will on the people."

Rev. Dr. W. J. Clark, at Woodstock Assembly, 1914, is reported in the Globe to have declared:

"If it was proved by such a vote that a considerable majority was not in favor of union, he would regret the fact, but he would not force the issue. But if there was only a small minority against it, he believed they should carry union into effect, even if it meant disruption, for there were worse things than disruption."

Rev. Dr. Herridge, at Kingston Assembly, 1915, said:

"I believe the matter must go on, the question must go to the people, and if the vote is not more decisive than the last vote I would oppose taking further action."

The second vote to which Drs. Clark and Herridge were looking forward, showed an increase of 23,000 votes against Union.

From all this, I maintain that the Presbyterian Assembly and Union leaders are committed to a policy of referendum to the people, from which they cannot honourably recede. If they have, in their hasty overzeal for organic union, committed themselves and their church to union with other churches, then they have made a double commitment, one of which must meantime be withdrawn. The honourable and courageous thing to do, is to notify the Methodists and Congregationalists of the human error they have made, and that they intend to stand by their first promises made to their own brethren of the Presbyterian Church.

Moreover, the rights of the people are imbedded in Presbyterianism. I hold with Dr. Charles Hodge, that "if the people possess the gifts and graces which qualify and entitle them to take part in the government of the church, then the exercise of that right tends to the development of those gifts and graces; and the denial of the right tends to their depression. In all the forms of despotism, whether civil or ecclesiastical, the people are degraded; in all forms of spiritual liberty, they are proportionally elevated." Are our present leaders of union beside themselves, in their desire to subdue "the minority?" Do they prefer autocratic despotism to Christian democracy under the sole Headship of our Lord? Are the people to be treated with high disdain or with loving respect?*

2. The doctrine and polity in the basis is evidently intended "as a platform to get into Union on, not to stand on in the United Church"†

As to the doctrine—It has the merit of brevity. It might be briefer still without loss. An obvious defect in the statement, however, is the traditional viewpoint. One would hardly suspect that it was written when the various sciences were having their profound influence in reshaping our understanding of religion, and when the social interpretation of Christianity was receiving emphasis.

Moreover, there is no definite credal subscription (Chapter III, C.). Therefore the United Church will be virtually creedless.

As to Polity—We are told by ardent unionists that this is to be what is historically known as "Presbyterian." I deprecate this deceptive campaign slogan. My analysis has shown it to be far from Presbyterian. The modifications of our ecclesiastical form of Presbyterian government are so radical as to make the basis of union a virtually new constitution, with Presbyterian names used, but much emptied of their significance.‡

3. *As to Legal Obstacles in the Basis of Union.*

This question being aside from the main drift of my book, the short presentation of it, in Chapter VI, above,

---

*See Rights of the People, Chapter V.
†See Chapters III., IV., V.
‡See Chapter V.

seems to me to be sufficiently adequate, with the exception of this fact of importance, viz., that organic union cannot be accomplished, without enabling legislation to overcome the grave obstacles to union, as presented in a book entitled, "The Public Statutes, relating to the Presbyterian Church in Canada, etc.," by the Hon. Thomas Wardlaw Taylor, Chief Justice of Manitoba. (Winnipeg: Hart and Company, 1897). In other words, the proposed Legislation is necessary in order to side step the common law, which we accept as a free church. It is also reactionary in that by it we subject our Creed and Church Government to the domination of members of Parliament. It is, moreover, obviously unfair to throw non-organic-union Presbyterians into the United Church, by an Act of Parliament, which would, at the same time, take away their rights.*

4. *The motives for and Against Union.*

I do not hesitate to state, as my honest and judicial decision, that the arguments against union far outweigh the arguments for union. In Chapter II, above, these have been given fully and impartially on the basis of facts. The motives for union are largely presuppositions, whereas those against union are for the most part solid facts, logically expressed.

Our study, however, has shown that the trend of thought to-day is away from the old individualism and in the direction of fellowship and co-operation. "It is not strange, therefore, if many Christian people are becoming dissatisfied with the spectacle of the broken body, and are catching a vision of a united church. That they are doing this, it is not necessary to prove; the signs are everywhere manifest. As to the kind of unity the future has in store for us, there may be a difference of opinion, but that the followers of Christ are being driven out of their old positions of isolation and antagonism into some form of co-operation, no man whose eyes are open to the signs of the times can doubt.

"The weakness of division must be clear to everyone. There was a time when it was a glorious thing to be strongly individualistic in religion. It meant something. It meant opposition to some mis-statement of Divine truth, or, it may be, some denial of human liberty. But now these old separations have in most cases lost their meaning. Many controversies have been buried and forgotten. Only students are sufficiently interested to look them up in an encyclopaedia.

---

*A study of the Proposed Legislation (Appendix IX.), and also Chapter VI., makes this objection preeminently clear.

"On the other hand the gains of unity are too clear to require any extended notice. There are tremendous social problems facing us, and in the presence of these problems, unless the Christian churches are going to stand together, there is very little chance of getting the principles of the Christian religion practically accepted in the world. Indeed there is a danger, that ecclesiastical organizations may be left high and dry, by the present onrush of social activity. Movements appropriating the Christian teaching, and with much of the Christian spirit, are springing up outside of the church. Where these are not hostile to the church, they are indifferent. In view of all this the cry for a closer union of the churches is timely, and there is great responsibility resting upon those, who do anything that is calculated to perpetuate unnecessary division."*

But what kind of Union do we need to meet the demands of our age. This is the crux of the whole situation with regard to the Canadian church union movement. Organic unionists are obsessed with the organic union ideal as the only solution. They have deliberately shut their eyes to any other plan, and have gone so far as to denounce all those, who do not accept their solution, as "anti-unionists." Herein lies the misunderstanding and scandal of ecclesiastical warfare and bitterness at the present time in Canada. The non-organic-unionists resent this nickname, and in reply claim they are the real unionists, because to their minds federal union, or the like, is a bigger conception by far than organic union. Organic union, they say, is a cheap and man-made panacea, having within it the certain promise of a monotonous, lethargic, mechanical religion, more or less destructive of religious and civil liberty. Christian vigour, and the beauty, and power associated with and springing out of the varieties of spiritual expression, they claim, will be marred by organic union. The writer, too, feels that a Canadian or even a universal Church, organically united would circumvent and cramp this necessary and desirable elasticity of religious freedom. It would blur the beauty of spiritual colours, tints, and shades. The problems of our day and nation can be better tackled and solved, not by throwing to the four winds of heaven these divinely bestowed gifts of diversity—nor by scrapping the great denominational churches, which are the product of centuries of co-operative development on the part of God and man together,—but by the larger vision of statesmanlike Federation, on a big and loving scale. Moreover, any union in Canada, which would leave out such churches as the Anglican, Baptist, Lutheran and others would be a very imperfect representative of the Protestantism of Canada. But I believe that a Federation or Confederation of all the Protestant bodies in Canada could be easily formed. And I believe that such a Federation, while preserving to every church its individuality and its inspirational history, would remedy any evils that result, from unwise denominational zeal, and would concentrate the United Protestant opinion of Canada upon the great moral and social problems of the day.

---

*An Article by Dr. J. Keir Fraser.

The writer is convinced that blindness to any other solutions of church and national problems, than mere organic union, has lead us to the crisis, with which we are now confronted. As spiritual leaders of the people we must be beside ourselves and utterly unreasonable, if we cannot hearken to the words of others, who hold different views on Christian Unity and Union. We must not allow ourselves to be swept off our feet by catch slogans of propagandism, as for example, "One United Protestant Church for Canada." Such a church is impossible, and could be nothing more than an institution built on a "sandheap of compromises." An "indigenous" church of that kind is neither necessary nor desirable. The Forestry department might just as foolishly order that only one kind of tree be made indigenous to Canadian soil. Denominations may have come from outside, but the people of Canada came with them and will continue to come, bringing with them their blood-bought spiritual liberties, in matters civil and religious. To say that we must obliterate these precious religious differences, in order to mould the character of our citizenship, by having only one Protestant National Church is glaringly absurd. Likewise it is even more stupid to claim that if Union is delayed, Canada will be split in twain and the East set against the West. Does Confederation mean nothing? Are all the Presbyterians dead in Western Canada? Are we British Canadian citizens, or are we a lot of undeveloped and squabbling children? Oh ye men of little statesmanship! Lift up your eyes, and behold our great Dominion already bound together,—despite our minor differences,—by imperial, national, commercial, financial, christian, and blood ties that are unbreakable. The Church itself could not split Canada, if she tried. The only possible split would be with the Roman Catholics of Quebec, if a United Protestant Church were strong enough and unchristian enough to start a quarrel with our fellow-Christians of the Roman Catholic faith. Beware of the religio-political motives for Union.

Even the Western situation does not necessarily demand organic union. (See Chapter II, B. Letters from Revs. Reid, Roxborough, Brown, etc.).

Is it fair for the West to force a split in the Church, when by Christian co-operation we may remain united? There is no valid reason why we should not carry on as a united Presbyterian Church, in happy fellowship and alignment with other denominations. It is very easily seen that it has been, and is being done, and no split has come. Let union leaders drop their partisan "with-a-view to union" and the crisis would be overcome. I give one example in proof of this hopeful possibility, which deserves serious and reasonable consideration:—

Rev. W. A. Cameron, Home Mission Superintendent of South Saskatchewan writes me as follows:—

Church Union in Saskatchewan.

"There are many types of Co-operation in Saskatchewan. During the last decade or so there has been a gradual elimination of overlapping, until now in only about 25 places outside the cities are both Methodist and Presbyterian Churches represented. The type that affects nearly all our mission fields and augmented congregations as well as some others, is where either one church or the other has given up territory or remained out of territory and thus left the work to the other church. These, in many cases, still call themselves Presbyterian or Methodist congregations or mission fields, as the case may be, or in some cases they style themselves Methodist or Presbyterian Co-operative churches or fields; of this type there are in Saskatchewan 225 congregations or mission fields supplied by the Presbyterian Church, and 124 operated by the Methodist Church. This type would perhaps more justly be called cases of co-operation rather than Church Union.

"Then there are 48 congregations in the province that are called doubly-affiliated united charges. The two congregations in the town or village unite as one congregation, having a communion roll divided into Presbyterian Church members and Methodist Church members. The Basis of Union is followed fairly closely. There is a Session, Board of Stewards and Official Board. Usually the members of these Boards are half Presbyterian and half Methodist. The minister is chosen alternately from both charges, the pastorate term being usually four years. The missionary money is divided 50/50 between the two churches.

"Then there are in the province 32 straight union churches. In most cases the minister is either Presbyterian or Methodist, though there are individual cases of the minister of a union church being Baptist or Anglican. These congregations are grouped into a couple of Presbyteries, and in conjunction with the union churches in Manitoba and Alberta they meet once a year in a General Council.

"There are cases where Church Union has been brought about by agitation on the part of ministers, either the minister of one of the congregations in a village or town, or by some one from outside, often a church official. But perhaps in the majority of cases union has been brought about by action on the part of the people who have considered that one church in the community would be preferable to two weaker ones. The cause has been very largely economic.

"My own view is that Organic Church Union is *not* necessary. I cannot see why the kind of co-operation that is being carried on, in connection with our Mission work, could not be continued without having to form a merger of the parent churches. In a small town or village, it is better to have one strong church than two weak ones. But by the double affiliated plan, each part of the united charge is still in direct touch with the parent church, while all the advantages of union are theirs. I cannot see why the doubly-affiliated union charge cannot be formed where conditions make it necessary, and still have the parent churches working together in harmony each in its own sphere. If it were decided to take another vote I believe the West would acquiesce in that decision.

"One thing more—Union has not helped the missionary funds of the churches. Very few of the 32 straight union churches have done anything for Missions since they were organized and some have been organized for years. Even in the case of the doubly affiliated unions, in very few cases have the givings of the United congregation equalled the combined givings of the separate congregations, before union was formed. In many cases the amount is much lower. The Home Mission Superintendent of the Methodist Church in Saskatchewan told me, a month ago, that the Methodist Church had lost in every case in missionary money, where double affiliation took place. Union has not meant more money for missionary work elsewhere."

This letter is one example of a good answer to the false argument that Union is already an accomplished fact. Why use such a camouflage argument when hundreds of these 1245 missions and small charges are more properly described as "co-operative" rather than "Union Churches?" It may be that many Western congregations will form a United Church if the parent bodies do not unite. That is their privilege and responsibility. My own view is that it would be better for them not to risk "Independency."

Some one has wisely said:—

"Many private members have an instinctive reluctance to merging their church in this big union, although their feeling is hardly articulate. They are almost bewildered by the enthusiasm of their leaders in planning the sacrifice of their church's identity. This, they feel ought at best to be a last resort. They would rather have its individuality preserved in a more comprehensive scheme of co-operation. They doubt if a larger federation, including the Anglicans and the Baptists would be brought any nearer by the proposed organic union."

Time and space forbids further discussion of arguments, suffice it to say:

"A remedy for all our ills, real or imaginary, can only be found on a large scale. Only in a movement of the spirit of God throughout the churches, only as a breath of nobility and enthusiasm sweep over them, only as they are carried away from the land-locked inlet into the open sea, can a sufficient moral and spiritual force be obtained. This thing is too great and difficult to be achieved in a committee-room. It must be reached by the uprising of the people, by a vast, concerted, magnanimous plan under the impulse of Christian love, and a passion for salvation of the people. We make a great mistake if we suppose that our churches are influenced by what is sectarian and narrow. They have been born in idealism, they represent in the world to-day the men who once were ready to sacrifice home, country, possessions, even life itself for the sake of an ideal. That which really appeals to them, and that which will in the long run determine their course of action is the will of God, not expediency or interest, but what God wills them to do, and we need not be afraid to rest the whole weight of our cause upon that issue."*

The trouble with organic union is that it has not been carried to us on the crest of a great spiritual tide, but co-operation undoubtedly has. Organic union has been too much dragged before us by the hand of man, not held up before our spiritual idealism by the hand of God. This union proposal has degenerated to the arena of politics. It has become an ecclesiastical football match between the so-called "majority" and "minority." Is it any wonder that thousands of Presbyterians regard this movement not as emanating from the will of God, but the stubborn mindedness of leaders, who have brought on the present disgraceful state of affairs by refusing to consider any other scheme of union than the proposed organic one? Is it any wonder that loyal Presbyterians will not budge an inch from their conscientious convictions to follow a will-o'-the-wisp? Is it any wonder they declare that "the Church's spiritual independence is no new one. It was inscribed, not infrequently in characters of blood, on many of the brightest and most memorable pages of our ecclesiastical history:—

"Like some ancient banner which has been borne in triumph through many a hard fought field, it hangs honoured and venerated within our Church's armoury: and there is no cause, it may be thought, why we should now be shaking the dust from its folds and flinging it again abroad to the winds of heaven.

"We should unfurl it. We have no need to design a new banner. We have one, I will not say in our armoury, but in our hands—the banner of religious equality. Borne sometimes in triumph, and sometimes in defeat, through many a hard fought field, it has often in these last dark years drooped over our sinking heads; but we have never allowed it to slip from our grasp, nor the dust of ages to gather on its folds, and once again we proudly fling it to the breeze, assured that multitudes will rally round it, and that, with firm hand and unfaltering step, they and we together shall carry it forward to hard-won but certain vic-

---

***The Churches at the Cross-Roads,* J. H. Shakespeare, (London).

tory. And on that historic banner we would now inscribe the words of John Locke:—

"ABSOLUTE LIBERTY, JUST AND TRUE LIBERTY, EQUAL AND IMPARTIAL LIBERTY, IS THE THING THAT WE STAND IN NEED OF."*

The whole argument for organic union ultimately rests on pessimism, which proclaims that the Church is decadent because of the "sin of denominationalism," and that organic union alone is the hope of Canadian Christianity. I repudiate both the hypothesis and the conclusion, and I join with the noble Thomas Nicholson† and buoyantly assert that:

"So far as the present generation is concerned and so far as we can see, at least in the generations immediately following it, we shall have the denominations, for we shall insist on freedom of thought, freedom of opinion, freedom of groupings, freedom of action. These will inevitably result because of the need for the efficiency of discipline, for the efficiency of government, and for the expression of group judgments in something like the present system of denominations; but through it all we must insist on the sincere search for truth and the devotion to the great central, moral, and religious purposes of the gospel. Wherever human thought and human knowledge are sufficiently perfect, we shall then be able to get a fairly unified action of the various groups for specific purposes at specific times. When the united force of the organization is thrown against a great evil, that evil must yield, and we shall have a community of nations instead of an autocracy, an intelligent voluntary unification of independent thinking groups rather than the compulsion of ecclesiastical authority. In our judgment the maintenance of the denominations with their unification for such great and specific objects in some such organization as the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America is the most rational ideal toward which we should work at this time."

In my own search for facts, I have found by numerous interviews and exchange of letters with organic union leaders, that these leaders not only stubbornly resist the consideration of any other scheme than organic union, but also they have been unable to give any satisfactory answer as to what an organically united church could accomplish that could not be accomplished through a Federal Council of

---

*[*The Scottish Church Question*, James Barr, (London).

†*The Christian Century*, Chicago.

Churches. Federation would be free from co-ercion, persecution, schism, and State interference. Why not consider it, either as a temporary step to organic union, of which it may prove to be a natural prelude; or better still why not consider it as an end in itself?

"If all the churches should to-morrow adopt one creed, they would at once begin to decline and in a year's time rival and warring factions would arise. Life everywhere thrives by rivalry, emulation, cross-fertilization. Churches are holy, not because alike, but because helpful. They are catholic, not because papal or Protestant, but because hospitable to all truth and inclusive of all men. They are apostolic, not because ancient, but because they send men out into the world as saints and heroes to labor, suffer, and conquer for God and humanity."*

"He is the freeman whom the truth makes free,
And all are slaves beside."

"Stand fast therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another."

**The Church of To-morrow*, J. H. Crocker, (N. Y.).

Appendix

Appendix I.

BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE REFORMED FAITH (U.S.A. 1905).

ARTICLE I.—OF GOD.

We believe in the ever-living God, who is a Spirit and the Father of our Spirits; infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in His being and perfections; the Lord Almighty, most just in all His ways, most glorious in holiness, unsearchable in wisdom and plenteous in mercy, full of love and compassion, and abundant in goodness and truth. We worship Him, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, three persons in one Godhead, one in substance and equal in power and glory.

ARTICLE II.—OF REVELATION.

We believe that God is revealed in nature, in history, and in the heart of man; that He has made gracious and clearer revelations of Himself to men of God who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit; and that Jesus Christ, the Word made flesh, is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person. We gratefully receive the Holy Scriptures, given by inspiration to be the faithful record of God's gracious revelations and the sure witness to Christ, as the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and life.

ARTICLE III.—OF THE ETERNAL PURPOSE.

We believe that the eternal, wise, holy, and loving purpose of God embraces all events, so that while the freedom of man is not taken away nor is God the author of sin, yet in His providence He makes all things work together in the fulfillment of His sovereign design and the manifestation of His glory, wherefore, humbly acknowledging the mystery of this truth, we trust in His protecting care and set our hearts to do His will.

ARTICLE IV.—OF THE CREATION.

We believe that God is the Creator, upholder, and governor of all things; that He is above all His works and in them all; and that He made man in His own image, meet for fellowship with Him, free and able to choose between good and evil, and forever responsible to his Maker and Lord.

ARTICLE V.—OF THE SIN OF MAN.

We believe that our first parents, being tempted, chose evil, and so fell away from God and came under the power of sin, the penalty of which is eternal death: and we confess that, by reason of this disobedience, we and all men are born with a sinful nature, that we have broken God's law, and that no man can be saved but by His grace.

ARTICLE VI.—OF THE GRACE OF GOD.

We believe that God, out of His great love for the world, has given His only begotten Son to be the Saviour of sinners, and in the Gospel freely offers His all-sufficient salvation to all men. And we praise Him for the unspeakable grace wherein He has provided a way of eternal life for all mankind.

ARTICLE VII.—OF ELECTION.

We believe that God, from the beginning, in His own good pleasure, gave to His Son a people, an innumerable multitude, chosen in Christ unto holiness, service, and salvation: we believe that all who come to years of discretion can receive this salvation only through faith and repentance: and we believe that all who die in infancy, and all others given by the Father to the Son who are beyond the reach of the outward means of grace, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who works when and where and how He pleases.

ARTICLE VIII.—OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

We believe in and confess the Lord Jesus Christ, the only Mediator between God and man, who, being the Eternal Son of God, for us men and for our salvation became truly man, being conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary, without sin; unto us He has revealed the Father, by His Word and Spirit making known the perfect will of God; for us He fulfilled all righteousness and satisfied eternal justice, offering Himself a perfect sacrifice upon the cross to take away the sin of the world; for us He rose from the dead and ascended into Heaven, where He ever intercedes for us; in our hearts, joined to Him by faith, He abides forever as the indwelling Christ; over us, and over all for us, He rules: wherefore, unto Him we render love, obedience, and adoration as our Prophet, Priest, and King forever.

ARTICLE IX.—OF FAITH AND REPENTANCE.

We believe that God pardons our sins and accepts us as righteous solely on the ground of the perfect obedience and sacrifice of Christ, received by faith alone; and that this saving faith is always accompanied by repentance, wherein we confess and forsake our sins with full purpose of, and endeavor after, a new obedience to God.

ARTICLE X.—OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of Life, who moves everywhere upon the hearts of men, to restrain them from evil and to incite them unto good, and whom the Father is ever willing to give unto all who ask Him. We believe that He has spoken by holy men of God in making known His truth to men for their salvation; that, through our exalted Saviour, He was sent forth in power to convict the world of sin, to enlighten men's minds in the knowledge of Christ, and to persuade and enable them to obey the call of the Gospel; and that He abides with the Church; dwelling in every believer as the spirit of truth, of holiness, and of comfort.

ARTICLE XI.—OF THE NEW BIRTH AND THE NEW LIFE.

We believe that the Holy Spirit only is the author and source of the new birth; we rejoice in the new life, wherein He is given unto us as the seal of sonship in Christ, and keeps loving fellowship with us, helps us in our infirmities, purges us from our faults, and ever continues His transforming work in us until we are perfected in the likeness of Christ, in the glory of the life to come.

ARTICLE XII.—OF THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE TO COME.

We believe that in the life to come the spirits of the just, at death made free from sin, enjoy immediate communion with God and the vision of His glory; and we confidently look for the general resurrection in the last day, when the bodies of those who sleep in Christ shall be fashioned in the likeness of the glorious body of their Lord, with whom they shall live and reign forever.

ARTICLE XIII.—OF THE LAW OF GOD.

We believe that the law of God, revealed in the Ten Commandments, and more clearly disclosed in the words of Christ, is forever established in truth and equity, so that no human work shall abide except it be built on this foundation. We believe that God requires of every man to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with his God; and that only through this harmony with the will of God shall be fulfilled that brotherhood of man wherein the kingdom of God is to be made manifest.

ARTICLE XIV.—OF THE CHURCH AND THE SACRAMENTS.

We believe in the Holy Catholic Church, of which Christ is the only Head. We believe that the Church Invisible consists of all the redeemed, and that the Church Visible embraces all who profess the true religion together with their children. We receive to our communion all who confess and obey Christ as their divine Lord and Saviour, and we hold fellowship with all believers in Him.

We receive the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, alone divinely established and committed to the Church, together with the Word, as means of grace; made effectual only by the Holy Spirit, and always to be used by Christians with prayer and praise to God.

ARTICLE XV.—OF THE LAST JUDGMENT.

We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ will come again in glorious majesty to judge the world and to make a final separation between the righteous and the wicked. The wicked shall receive the eternal award of their sins, and the Lord will manifest the glory of His mercy in the salvation of His people and their entrance upon the full enjoyment of eternal life.

ARTICLE XVI.—OF CHRISTIAN SERVICE AND THE FINAL TRIUMPH.

We believe that it is our duty, as servants and friends of Christ, to do good unto all men, to maintain the public and private worship of God, to hallow the Lord's Day, to preserve the sanctity of the family, to uphold the just authority of the State, and so to live in all honesty, purity and charity, that our lives shall testify of Christ. We joyfully receive the word of Christ, bidding His people go into all the world and make disciples of all nations, and declare unto them that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, and that He will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. We confidently trust that by His power and grace, all His enemies and ours shall be finally overcome, and the kingdoms of this world shall be made the kingdom of our God and of His Christ. In this faith we abide; in this service we labor; and in this hope we pray,

Even so, come, Lord Jesus.

Attest: Henry Van Dyke, Moderator General Assembly, 1902.
W. H. Roberts, Stated Clerk.

Appendix II.

THE ARTICLES OF THE FAITH OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF ENGLAND

I.—Of God.

We believe in, and adore, one living and true God, Who is spirit, personal, infinite, and eternal, present in every place, the almighty Author and sovereign Lord of all; most blessed, most holy, and most free; perfect in wisdom, justice, truth and love; to us most merciful and gracious; unto Whom only we must cleave, Whom only we must worship and obey. To Him be glory for ever. Amen.

II.—Of the Trinity.

We acknowledge, with the ancient Church, the mystery of the Holy Trinity as revealed in Scripture, and believe that in the unity of the ever blessed Godhead there are three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, of one substance, equal in power and glory.

III.—Of Creation.

We believe that Almighty God, for His own holy and loving ends, was pleased in the beginning to create the heavens and the earth, by the Son, the Eternal Word; and, through progressive stages, to fashion and order this world, giving life to every creature; and to make man in His own image, that he might glorify and enjoy God, occupying and subduing the earth and having dominion over the creatures, to the praise of his Maker's name.

IV.—Of Providence.

We believe that God the Creator upholds all things by the word of His power, preserving and providing for all His creatures, according to the laws of their being; and that He, through the presence and energy of His Spirit in nature and history, disposes and governs all events for His own high design: yet is He not in any wise the author or approver of sin, neither are the freedom and responsibility of man taken away, nor have any bounds been set to the sovereign liberty of Him Who worketh when and where and how He pleaseth.

V.—Of the Fall.

We believe and confess that our first father, Adam, the representative head as well as common ancestor of mankind, transgressed the commandment of God through temptation of the devil, by which transgression he fell from his original state of innocence and communion with God; and so all mankind, being in him, have come under just condemnation, are subject to the penalty of death, and inherit a sinful nature, estranged from God, from which proceed all actual transgressions: and we acknowledge that out of this condition no man is able to deliver himself.

VI.—Of Saving Grace.

We believe and proclaim that God, Who is rich in mercy as well as of perfect justice, was moved by His great love to man to hold forth from the first a promise of redemption, which from age to age He confirmed and unfolded, and that, in the fulness of the time, He accomplished His gracious purpose by sending His Son to be the Saviour of the world: wherefore our salvation out of sin and misery is ever to be ascribed to free and sovereign grace.

VII.—Of the Lord Jesus Christ.

We believe in and confess, with the ancient Church, the Lord Jesus Christ, Who, being the eternal Son of God, became man by taking to Himself a true body and soul, yet without sin, being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary; so that He is both God and Man, two whole perfect and distinct natures, the divine and the human, being inseparably joined together in one person, that He might be the Mediator between God and man, by Whom alone we must be saved.

VIII.—Of the Work of Christ.

We believe that the Mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ, being anointed with the Holy Spirit to proclaim and set up the Kingdom of God among men, did by His perfect life on earth, through words and deeds of grace, and by His death upon the cross, declare the Father, Whose image He is; and did fully satisfy divine justice, and obtain for us forgiveness of sins, reconciliation to God, and the gift of eternal life, through His obedience on our behalf to the law and will of His Father, even unto death, wherein, bearing our sins, He offered Himself up a sacrifice without spot to God.

IX.—Of the Exaltation of Christ.

We believe that Jesus Christ, being for our offences crucified, dead, and buried, saw no corruption, but was raised again on the third day, in Whose risen life we live anew, and have the pledge of a blessed resurrection; that in the same body in which He rose He ascended into heaven, where, as our High Priest, He maketh continual intercession for us; and that He sitteth at the right hand of God, Head of the Church, clothed with authority and power as Lord over all.

X.—Of the Gospel.

We hold fast and proclaim that God, Who willeth that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth, has, by

His Son our Saviour, given commission to the Church to preach unto all nations the Gospel of His grace, wherein He freely offers to all men forgiveness and eternal life, calling on them to turn from sin, and to receive and rest by faith upon the Lord Jesus Christ.

XI.—Of the Holy Spirit.

We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the Giver of Life, Who worketh freely as He will, without Whose quickening grace there is no salvation, and Whom the Father never withholds from any who ask for Him; and we give thanks that He has in every age moved on the hearts of men; that He spake by the prophets; that through our exalted Saviour He was sent forth in power to convict the world of sin; to enlighten the minds of men in the knowledge of Christ, and to persuade and enable them to obey the call of the Gospel; and that He abides with the Church, dwelling in every believer as the Spirit of truth, of holiness, and of comfort.

XII.—Of Election and Regeneration.

We humbly own and believe that God the Father, before the foundation of the world, was pleased of His sovereign grace to choose unto Himself in Christ a people, whom He gave to the Son, and to whom the Holy Spirit imparts spiritual life by a secret and wonderful operation of His power, using as His ordinary means, where years of understanding have been reached, the truths of His Word in ways agreeable to the nature of man; so, that, being born from above, they are the children of God, created in Christ Jesus unto good works.

XIII.—Of Justification by Faith.

We believe that every one, who through the grace of the Holy Spirit repents and believes the Gospel, confessing and forsaking his sins, and humbly relying upon Christ alone for salvation, is freely pardoned and accepted as righteous in the sight of God, solely on the ground of Christ's perfect obedience and atoning sacrifice.

XIV.—Of Sonship in Christ.

We believe that those who receive Christ by faith are united to Him, so that they are partakers in His life, and receive of His fulness; and that they are adopted into the family of God, are made heirs with Christ, and have His Spirit abiding in them, the witness to their sonship, and the earnest of their inheritance.

XV.—Of the Law and New Obedience.

We believe and acknowledge that the Lord Jesus Christ has laid His people by His grace under new obligation to keep the perfect Law of God, and has by precept and example enlarged our knowledge of that Law, and illustrated the spirit of filial love in which the divine will is to be obeyed; and we bless God that the obedience of Christians, though in this life always imperfect, yet being the fruit of their union to Christ, is accepted for His sake and well-pleasing to God.

XVI.—Of Sanctification and Perseverance.

We believe that the Holy Spirit dwelling in all Christ's people purifies their hearts, enabling them to do freely and cheerfully that which the will of God requires, so that in measure as they surrender themselves to the Spirit of Christ, and follow the guidance of His Word, they receive strength for daily service, and grow in holiness after the image of their Lord; or if, departing from God through unwatchfulness and neglect of prayer, any of them lapse into spiritual languor, or fall into grievous sins, yet by the mercy of God Who abideth faithful they are not cast off, but are chastened for their backsliding, and through repentance restored to His favour, so that they perish not.

XVII.—Of the Church.

We acknowledge one Holy Catholic Church, the innumerable company of saints of every age and nation, who, being united by the Holy Spirit to Christ their Head, are one body in Him, and have communion with their Lord and with one another; further, we receive it as the will of Christ that His Church on earth should exist as a visible and sacred brotherhood, consisting of those who profess faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him, together with their children, and organized for the confession of His name, the public worship of God, the upbuilding of the saints, and the proclamation of the Gospel; and we acknowledge, as a part, more or less pure, of this universal brotherhood, every particular Church throughout the world which professes this faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him, as Divine Lord and Saviour.

XVIII.—Of Church Order and Fellowship.

We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ, the sole Head of His Church, has appointed its worship, teaching, discipline and government to be administered according to His will revealed in Holy Scripture, by officers chosen for their fitness, and duly set apart to their office; and although the visible Church, even in its purest branch, may contain unworthy members, and is liable to err, yet believers ought not lightly to separate themselves from its communion, but are to live in fellowship with their brethren: which fellowship is to be extended, as God gives opportunity, to all who in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jesus.

XIX.—Of Holy Scripture.

We believe that God, Who manifests Himself in creation and providence, and especially in the spirit of man, has been pleased to reveal His mind and will for our salvation at successive periods and in various ways; and that this Revelation has been, so far as needful, committed to writing by men inspired of the Holy Spirit, in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, which are therefore to be devoutly studied by all as God's written Word or message to mankind; and we reverently acknowledge the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scriptures to be the Supreme Judge in questions of faith and duty.

XX.—Of the Sacraments.

We acknowledge Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the two Sacraments instituted by Christ, to be of perpetual obligation, as signs and seals of the new covenant, ratified in His precious blood; through the observance of which His Church is to confess her Lord and to be visibly distinguished from the rest of the world; Baptism with water into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost being the sacrament of admission into the visible Church, in which are set forth our union to Christ and regeneration by the Spirit, the remission of our sins, and our engagement to be the Lord's; and the Lord's Supper, the sacrament of communion with Christ and with His people, in which bread and wine are given and received in thankful remembrance of Him and of His sacrifice on the cross, and in which they who in faith receive the same do, after a spiritual manner, partake of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, to their comfort, nourishment, and growth in grace.

XXI.—Of the Second Advent.

We assuredly believe that on a day known only to God, the Lord Jesus Christ will suddenly come again from heaven with power and great glory; and we look for this second appearing of our Saviour as the blessed hope of His Church, for which we ought always to wait in sober watchfulness and diligence, that we may be found ready at His coming.

XXII.—Of the Resurrection.

We believe that the souls of the righteous enter at death upon a state of rest and felicity at home with the Lord; that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust, through the power of the Son of God; and that the bodies of all who are fallen asleep in Christ, as well as of the faithful who are alive at His coming, shall be fashioned anew and conformed to the body of His glory.

XXIII.—Of the Last Judgment.

We believe that God will judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ, before Whom all men must appear, Who shall separate the righteous from the wicked, make manifest the secrets of the heart, and render to every man according to the deeds which he hath done in the body, whether good or evil, when the wicked shall go away into eternal punishment but the righteous into eternal life.

XXIV.—Of the Life Everlasting.

Finally, we believe in and desire the life everlasting in which the redeemed shall receive their inheritance of glory in the kingdom of their Father, and be made fully blessed in the presence and service of God, Whom they shall see and enjoy for ever and ever. Amen.

Appendix III.

DOCTRINAL BASIS OF UNION
PROPOSED BY THE
MONTREAL LOCAL COMMITTEE

The Montreal Section of the Joint Committee of the three negotiating churches, on the consideration of the possibility of finding a Doctrinal Basis of Union, have unanimously adopted the following articles as being in their judgment a doctrinal statement likely to prove acceptable to all the negotiating churches and a copy is now sent to each member of the joint Committee, in the hope that it may form the basis for further discussion. No recommendation is made as to any terms of subscription as that matter has been referred to another committee.

JOHN SCRIMGER, *Chairman.*
W. H. WARRINER, *Secretary.*

MONTREAL, November, 1905.

ARTICLES OF FAITH

I.—OF GOD.

We believe in and adore one living and true God, the Almighty and loving Father, who is a spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in His being and attributes.

II.—OF THE TRINITY.

We believe that the Godhead is eternally triune, embracing the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, who are of one substance, equal in power and glory.

III.—OF CREATION AND PROVIDENCE.

We believe that God was pleased through his Son, the Eternal Word, to create the heavens and the earth, with all that they contain for the manifestation of His glorious character and for the well being of His creatures; that He upholds all things by His power, preserving and providing for all His creatures according to the laws of their being; and that He, through the presence and energy of His Holy Spirit in nature and in history, disposes and governs all events for His own sovereign purpose, yet is He not in any wise the author of sin, nor are the freedom and responsibility of man taken away.

IV.—OF MAN.

We believe that man was made in the image of God, so that he may rule over the earth and attain to perfect holiness of character, but that the whole human race has gone astray from the beginning; and that, though good impulses and worthy desires may exist in the heart, evil is hereditary and universal, all men being, apart from grace, estranged from God, inclined to sin, and disobedient to the law of right, to such a degree that no man is able to deliver himself out of this sinful condition and its consequent disobedience, which unless repented of and forgiven leads to eternal death.

V.—Of Salvation.

We believe that God who is rich in mercy as well as perfect in justice, was moved by His great love for man to provide from the first redemption from sin, and that in the fulness of time He sent His Son Jesus Christ to be the Saviour of the world. We believe that God, who wills that all men should be saved, freely offers to all men through Jesus Christ the gospel of the forgiveness of sins and of eternal life on condition that they repent of their sins and turn to God with faith in His mercy.

VI.—Of the Lord Jesus Christ.

We believe in Jesus Christ as the Son of God and our Lord: that He was born of the Virgin Mary, lived a holy life and taught the way of righteousness as recorded in the Gospels, that He was crucified and died, that He rose again from the dead and ascended into heaven, and that He is coming again to judge the world. We believe that He is at once truly God and truly man, and so fitted to be mediator between God and man, that His obedience was pleasing to the Father, and that His sufferings were vicarious and propitiatory so that we might be reconciled to God through Him.

VII.—Of the Holy Spirit.

We believe in the Holy Spirit, the giver of all life, that He has ever moved on the hearts of men to lead them to repentance, that He spoke by the prophets in the ages before Christ came, that through the exalted Saviour he was sent forth to convict the world of sin, to enlighten the minds of men in the knowledge of the truth, to persuade and enable them to obey the call of the Gospel, that He imparts spiritual life by a secret and wonderful operation of His power, using as the ordinary means the truths of His word in ways agreeable to the nature of man.

VIII.—Of Justification and Sonship in Christ.

We believe that all who through the grace of the Holy Spirit repent and believe the Gospel, confessing and forsaking their sins and humbly relying upon Christ alone for salvation, are freely pardoned and accepted as righteous in the sight of God, and that they are adopted as sons of God, with a right to all the privileges therein implied, including a conscious assurance of their sonship.

IX.—Of Sanctification.

We believe that the Holy Spirit dwells in all who heartily accept the gospel, purifies their hearts, enabling them to do freely and cheerfully that which the will of God requires, so that, in the measure in which they surrender themselves to the will of Christ and follow the guidance of His word, they receive strength for daily service and grow in holiness after the image of the Lord, that though they may sin and fall God is able to keep them from falling and to restore them to the way of life, so that they perish not, Whose will is that they should be wholly delivered from the power and pollution as well as from the guilt of sin and matured in all the graces of the Holy Spirit.

X.—Of Revelation.

We believe that God has progressively revealed Himself to mankind, that the full and complete revelation of the character and will of God to man is the Lord Jesus Christ, that, while every man is bound to follow his own reason and conscience as illuminated by the Holy Spirit, he is equally bound to take all possible means of gaining the fullest light for his guidance, that the supreme authority in doctrine and duty is the Holy Spirit speaking through His servants in the Old and New Testaments as these have been received by the church universal and understood according to sound principles of interpretation.

XI.—Of the Church.

We acknowledge one holy catholic church, the innumerable company of saints of every age and nation, who, being united by the Holy Spirit to Christ their head, are one body in Him, and have communion with their Lord and with one another; further we receive it as the will of Christ that His church on earth should exist as a visible and sacred brotherhood, consisting of those who profess faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him, and organized for the confession of His name, for the public worship of God, for the administration of sacraments, and for the universal proclamation of the Gospel; and we acknowledge as a part more or less pure of this universal brotherhood every particular church throughout the world which professes this faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him as Divine Lord and Saviour.

XII.—Of the Ministry.

We believe that Jesus Christ, as the Supreme Head of the Church, calls men to the ministry of the word, that the church, under the guidance of the Spirit of Christ, recognizes and chooses those whom He calls, and who may be thereupon officially set apart to the work of the ministry.

XIII.—Of Church Order and Fellowship.

We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ is the sole head of the Church, that its worship, teaching, discipline, and government should be administered according to His will by officers chosen for their fitness and duly set apart to their office; and, although the visible church may contain unworthy members and is liable to err, yet believers ought not lightly to separate themselves from its communion, but are to live in fellowship with their brethren, which fellowship is to be extended as God gives opportunity to all who in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jesus.

XIV.—Of the Sacraments.

We acknowledge Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the two sacraments instituted by Christ, to be of perpetual obligation as signs and seals of the covenant ratified in His precious blood, through the observance of which His Church is to confess her Lord and be visibly distinguished from the rest of the world.

(1) Baptism with water into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost is the sacrament which implies our relation to the covenant of grace and our consecration to the christian life and typifies our union to Christ and regeneration of the Spirit and the washing away of our sins. The proper subjects of baptism are believers and infants. In the latter case the parents should be admonished to train up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and the church is under the most solemn obligation to provide for their christian instruction.

(2) The Lord's Supper is the sacrament of communion with Christ and with His people, in which bread and wine are given and received in thankful remembrance of Him and His sacrifice on the cross, and which they who in faith receive the same do, after a spiritual manner, partake of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ to their comfort, nourishment and growth in grace. All those may be admitted to the Lord's Supper who profess their faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and are living in obedience to His law, free from scandal, crime and open sin.

XV.—Of the Resurrection and Future Life.

We believe that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust, through the power of the Son of God; that the finally impenitent shall suffer eternal death, and the righteous shall abide in blessedness for ever with God.

Appendix IV.

INTERIM REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON DOCTRINE, BASED ON APPENDICES I AND III.

Article I.—Of God.

We believe in the one only living and true God, who is a Spirit and the Father of our Spirits; infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in His being and perfections; the Lord Almighty, most just in all His ways, most glorious in holiness, unsearchable in wisdom and plenteous in mercy, full of love and compassion, and abundant in goodness and truth. We worship Him, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, three persons in one Godhead, one in substance and equal in power and glory.

Article II.—Of Revelation.

We believe that God is revealed in part in nature, in history, and in the heart of man; that He has made gracious and clearer revelations of Himself to men of God who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit; and that Jesus Christ, the Word made flesh, is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person. We gratefully receive the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament and New Testament given by inspiration to be the faithful record of God's gracious revelations and the sure witness to Christ, as the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and life.

Article III.—Of the Divine Purpose.

We believe that the eternal, wise, holy, and loving purpose of God embraces all events, so that while the freedom of man is not taken away nor is God the author of sin, yet in His providence He makes all things work together in the fulfilment of His sovereign design and the manifestation of His glory.

Article IV.—Of Creation and Providence.

We believe that God is the Creator, upholder, and governor of all things; that He is above all His works and in them all; and that He made man in His own image, meet for fellowship with Him, free and able to choose between good and evil, and forever responsible to his Maker and Lord.

Article V.—Of the Sin of Man.

We believe that our first parents, being tempted, chose evil, and so fell away from God and came under the power of sin, the penalty of which is eternal death; and we confess that, by reason of this disobedience, we and all men are born with a sinful nature, that we have broken God's law, and that no man can be saved but by His grace.

ARTICLE VI.—OF THE GRACE OF GOD.

We believe that God, out of His great love for the world, has given his only begotten Son to be the Saviour of sinners, and in the Gospel freely offers His all-sufficient salvation to all men. We believe also that God, from the beginning, in His own good pleasure, gave to His Son a people, an innumerable multitude, chosen in Christ unto holiness, service, and salvation.

ARTICLE VII.—OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST.

We believe in and confess the Lord Jesus Christ, the only Mediator between God and man, who, being the Eternal Son of God, for us men and for our salvation became truly man, being conceived of the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary, without sin; unto us He has revealed the Father, by His Word and Spirit making known the perfect will of God; for us He fulfilled all righteousness and satisfied eternal justice, offering Himself a perfect sacrifice upon the cross to take away the sin of the world; for us He rose from the dead and ascended into Heaven, where He ever intercedes for us; in our hearts, joined to Him by faith, He abides forever as the indwelling Christ; over us, and over all for us, He rules: wherefore, unto Him we render love, obedience, and adoration as our Prophet, Priest, and King forever.

ARTICLE VIII.—OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of Life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, who moves everywhere upon the hearts of men, to restrain them from evil and to incite them unto good, and whom the Father is ever willing to give unto all who ask Him. We believe that He has spoken by holy men of God in making known His truth to men for their salvation; that, through our exalted Saviour, He was sent forth in power to convict the world of sin, to enlighten men's minds in the knowledge of Christ, and to persuade and enable them to obey the call of the Gospel; and that He abides with the Church, dwelling in every believer as the spirit of truth, of holiness, and of comfort.

ARTICLE IX.—OF FAITH AND REPENTANCE.

We believe that faith in Christ is a saving grace whereby we receive Him, trust in Him and rest upon Him alone for salvation, as He is offered to us in the Gospel, and that this saving faith is always accompanied by repentance, wherein we confess and forsake our sins with full purpose of, and endeavor after, a new obedience to God.

ARTICLE X.—OF JUSTIFICATION AND SONSHIP.

We believe that God pardons our sins and accepts us as righteous solely on the ground of the perfect obedience and sacrifice of Christ, received by faith alone, and that believers are adopted as sons of God, with a right to all the privileges therein implied including a conscious assurance of their sonship.

ARTICLE XI.—OF REGENERATION.

We believe in the necessity of regeneration, whereby we are made new creatures in Christ Jesus by the Spirit of God, who imparts spiritual life by a secret and wonderful operation of His power, using as the ordinary means the truths of His Word and the ordinances of Divine appointment in ways agreeable to the nature of man.

ARTICLE XII.—SANCTIFICATION.

We believe that those who are regenerated and justified grow in sanctified character through fellowship with Christ, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and obedience to the truth; that a holy life is the fruit and evidence of saving faith; and that the believer's hope of continuance in such a life is in the preserving grace of God.

And we believe that in this growth in grace Christians may attain to a full assurance of faith, and to that maturity of faith working by love which the Scriptures call the love of God made perfect in us.

ARTICLE XIII.—OF THE LAW OF GOD.

We believe that the law of God, revealed in the Ten Commandments, and more clearly disclosed in the words of Christ, is forever established in truth and equity, so that no human work shall abide except it be built on this foundation. We believe that God requires of every man to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with his God; and that only through this harmony with the will of God shall be fulfilled that brotherhood of man wherein the Kingdom of God is to be made manifest.

Appendix V.

THE BASIS OF UNION

AS AGREED UPON BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE PRESBYTERIAN, METHODIST AND CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES.

General.

1. The name of the Church formed by the union of the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational Churches in Canada, shall be "The United Church of Canada."

2. It shall be the policy of The United Church to foster the spirit of unity in the hope that this sentiment of unity may in due time, so far as Canada is concerned, take shape in a church which may fittingly be described as national.

Doctrine.

We, the representatives of the Presbyterian, the Methodist, and the Congregational branches of the Church of Christ in Canada, do hereby set forth the substance of the Christian faith, as commonly held among us. In doing so, we build upon the foundation laid by the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. We affirm our belief in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the primary source and ultimate standard of Christian faith and life. We acknowledge the teaching of the great creeds of the ancient Church. We further maintain our allegiance to the evangelical doctrines of the Reformation, as set forth in common in the doctrinal standards adopted by the Presbyterian Church in Canada, by the Congregational Union of Ontario and Quebec, and by the Methodist Church. We present the accompanying statement as a brief summary of our common faith and commend it to the studious attention of the members and adherents of the negotiating Churches, as in substance agreeable to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures.

Article I.—Of God.

We believe in the one only living and true God, a Spirit, infinite, eternal and unchangeable, in His being and perfections; the Lord Almighty, who is love, most just in all His ways, most glorious in holiness, unsearchable in wisdom, plenteous in mercy, full of compassion, and abundant in goodness and truth. We worship Him in the unity of the Godhead and the mystery of the Holy Trinity, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, three persons of the same substance, equal in power and glory.

Article II.—Of Revelation.

We believe that God has revealed Himself in nature, in history, and in the heart of man; that He has been graciously pleased to make clearer revelation of Himself to men of God who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit; and that in the fulness of time He has perfectly revealed Himself in Jesus Christ, the Word made flesh, who is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person. We receive the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, given by inspiration of God, as containing the only infallible rule of faith and life, a faithful record of God's gracious revelations, and as the sure witness to Christ.

Article III.—Of the Divine Purpose.

We believe that the eternal, wise, holy and loving purpose of God so embraces all events that while the freedom of man is not taken away, nor is God the author of sin, yet in His providence He makes all things work together in the fulfilment of His sovereign design and the manifestation of His glory.

Article IV.—Of Creation and Providence.

We believe that God is the creator, upholder and governor of all things; that He is above all His works and in them all; and that He made man in his own image, meet for fellowship with Him, free and able to choose between good and evil, and responsible to his Maker and Lord.

Article V.—Of the Sin of Man.

We believe that our first parents, being tempted, chose evil, and so fell away from God and came under the power of sin, the penalty of which is eternal death; and that, by reason of this disobedience, all men are born with a sinful nature, that we have broken God's law and that no man can be saved but by His grace.

Article VI.—Of the Grace of God.

We believe that God, out of His great love for the world, has given his only begotten Son to be the Saviour of sinners, and in the Gospel freely offers His all-sufficient salvation to all men. We believe also that God, in His own good pleasure, gave to His Son a people, an innumerable multitude, chosen in Christ unto holiness, service and salvation.

Article VII.—Of the Lord Jesus Christ.

We believe in and confess the Lord Jesus Christ, the only Mediator between God and man, who, being the Eternal Son of God, for us men and for our salvation became truly man, being conceived of the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary, yet without sin. Unto us He has revealed the Father, by His word and Spirit, making known the perfect will of God. For our redemption He fulfilled all righteousness, offered Himself a perfect sacrifice on the cross, satisfied Divine justice and made propitiation for the sins of the whole world. He rose from the dead and ascended into Heaven, where He ever intercedes for us. In the hearts of believers He abides forever as the indwelling Christ; above us and over us all He rules; wherefore, unto Him we render love, obedience and adoration as our Prophet, Priest and King.

ARTICLE VIII.—OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, who moves upon the hearts of men to restrain them from evil and to incite them unto good, and whom the Father is ever willing to give unto all who ask Him. We believe that He has spoken by holy men of God in making known His truth to men for their salvation; that, through our exalted Saviour, He was sent forth in power to convict the world of sin, to enlighten men's minds in the knowledge of Christ, and to persuade and enable them to obey the call of the Gospel; and that He abides with the Church, dwelling in every believer as the spirit of truth, of power, of holiness, of comfort and of love.

ARTICLE IX.—OF REGENERATION.

We believe in the necessity of regeneration, whereby we are made new creatures in Christ Jesus by the Spirit of God, who imparts spiritual life by the gracious and mysterious operation of His power, using as the ordinary means the truths of His word and the ordinances of divine appointment in ways agreeable to the nature of man.

ARTICLE X.—OF FAITH AND REPENTANCE.

We believe that faith in Christ is a saving grace whereby we receive Him, trust in Him and rest upon Him alone for salvation as He is offered to us in the Gospel, and that this saving faith is always accompanied by repentance, wherein we confess and forsake our sins with full purpose of and endeavor after a new obedience to God.

ARTICLE XI.—OF JUSTIFICATION AND SONSHIP.

We believe that God, on the sole ground of the perfect obedience and sacrifice of Christ, pardons those who by faith receive Him as their Saviour and Lord, accepts them as righteous and bestows upon them the adoption of sons, with a right to all the privileges therein implied, including a conscious assurance of their sonship.

ARTICLE XII.—OF SANCTIFICATION.

We believe that those who are regenerated and justified grow in the likeness of Christ through fellowship with Him, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, the obedience to the truth; that a holy life is the fruit and evidence of saving faith; and that the believer's hope of continuance in such a life is in the preserving grace of God. And we believe that in this growth in grace Christians may attain that maturity and full assurance of faith whereby the love of God is made perfect in us.

ARTICLE XIII.—OF PRAYER.

We believe that we are encouraged to draw near to God, our Heavenly Father, in the name of His Son, Jesus Christ, and on our own behalf and that of others to pour out our hearts humbly yet freely before Him, as becomes His beloved children, giving Him the honor and praise due His holy name, asking Him to glorify Himself on earth as in heaven, confessing unto Him our sins and seeking of Him every gift needful for this life and for our everlasting salvation. We believe also that, inasmuch as all true prayer is prompted by His Spirit, He will in response thereto grant us every blessing according to His unsearchable wisdom and the riches of His grace in Jesus Christ.

ARTICLE XIV.—OF THE LAW OF GOD.

We believe that the moral law of God, summarized in the Ten Commandments, testified to by the prophets and unfolded in the life and teachings of Jesus Christ, stands forever in truth and equity, and is not made void by faith, but on the contrary is established thereby. We believe that God requires of every man to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God; and that only through this harmony with the will of God shall be fulfilled that brotherhood of man wherein the kingdom of God is to be made manifest.

ARTICLE XV.—OF THE CHURCH.

We acknowledge one Holy Catholic Church, the innumerable company of saints of every age and nation, who being united by the Holy Spirit to Christ their Head are one body in Him and have communion with their Lord and with one another. Further, we receive it as the will of Christ that His Church on earth should exist as a visible and sacred brotherhood, consisting of those who profess faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him, together with their children, and other baptized children, and organized for the confession of His name, for the public worship of God, for the administration of the sacraments, for the upbuilding of the saints, and for the universal propagation of the Gospel; and we acknowledge as a part, more or less pure, of this universal brotherhood, every particular Church throughout the world which professes this faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him as divine Lord and Saviour.

ARTICLE XVI.—OF THE SACRAMENTS.

We acknowledge two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which were instituted by Christ, to be of perpetual obligation as signs and seals of the covenant ratified in His precious blood, as means of grace, by which, working in us, He doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and comfort our faith in Him, and as ordinances through the observance of which His Church is to confess her Lord and be visibly distinguished from the rest of the world.

(1) Baptism with water into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit is the sacrament by which are signified and sealed our union to Christ and participation in the blessings of the new covenant. The proper subjects of baptism are believers, and infants presented by their parents or guardians in the Christian faith. In the latter case the parents or guardians should train up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and should expect that their children will, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, receive the benefits which the sacrament is designed and fitted to convey. The Church is under the most solemn obligation to provide for their Christian instruction.

(2) The Lord's Supper is the sacrament of communion with Christ and with His people, in which bread and wine are given and received in thankful remembrance of Him and His sacrifice on the cross; and they who in faith receive the same do, after a spiritual manner, partake of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, to their comfort, nourishment and growth in grace. All may be admitted to the Lord's Supper who make a credible profession of their faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and of obedience to His law.

ARTICLE XVII.—OF THE MINISTRY.

We believe that Jesus Christ, as the Supreme Head of the Church, has appointed therein a ministry of the word and sacraments, and calls men to this ministry; that the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, recognizes and chooses those whom He calls, and should thereupon duly ordain them to the work of the ministry.

ARTICLE XVIII.—OF CHURCH ORDER AND FELLOWSHIP.

We believe that the Supreme and only Head of the Church is the Lord Jesus Christ; that its worship, teaching, discipline and government should be administered according to His will by persons chosen for their fitness and duly set apart to their office, and that although the visible Church may contain unworthy members and is liable to err, yet believers ought not lightly to separate themselves from its communion, but are to live in fellowship with their brethren, which fellowship is to be extended, as God gives opportunity, to all who in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jesus.

ARTICLE XIX.—OF THE RESURRECTION, THE LAST JUDGMENT AND THE FUTURE LIFE.

We believe that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust, through the power of the Son of God, who shall come to judge the living and the dead; that the finally impenitent shall go away into eternal punishment and the righteous into life eternal.

ARTICLE XX.—OF CHRISTIAN SERVICE AND THE FINAL TRIUMPH.

We believe that it is our duty as disciples and servants of

Christ, to further the extension of His Kingdom, to do good unto all men, to maintain the public and private worship of God, to hallow the Lord's Day, to preserve the inviolability of marriage and the sanctity of the family, to uphold the just authority of the State, and so to live in all honesty, purity and charity that our lives shall testify of Christ. We joyfully receive the word of Christ, bidding His people go into all the world and make disciples of all nations, declaring unto them that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, and that He will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. We confidently believe that by His power and grace all His enemies shall finally be overcome, and the kingdoms of this world be made the kingdom of our God and of His Christ.

POLITY

The Joint Committee, after an examination of the forms of church government of the negotiating Churches and the practical working thereof, is greatly gratified to find:

1. That while the officers and courts of the negotiating Churches may bear different names, there is a substantial degree of similarity in the duties and functions of these officers and courts.

2. That, engaged in the same work, with the same object in view, and earnestly endeavoring to meet the conditions confronting the Churches in Canada, the negotiating Churches have been steadily approximating more nearly to each other, both in forms of church government and methods of administration.

3. That there are distinctive elements in each which would add to the efficiency of a united Church, and which can be preserved with great advantage in the form of polity to be adopted for The United Church.

4. That in this view it is possible to provide for substantial local freedom, and at the same time secure the benefits of a strong connexional tie and co-operative efficiency.

The following recommendations are submitted as setting forth the Polity proposed for The United Church of Canada.

I.—The Church.

1. The members of The United Church shall be the members of the negotiating Churches, and such others as may hereafter become members.

2. The unit of organizations for The United Church shall be The Pastoral Charge. A pastoral charge may consist of more than one local church; a local church is a body of persons meeting for public worship in one place.

3. The governing bodies or courts of the Church, higher than those of the pastoral charge, shall be:

(*a*) The Presbytery.
(*b*) The Conference.
(*c*) The General Council.

II.—The Pastoral Charge (Circuit or Congregation.)

(*a*)—*Charges existing previous to the Union.*

4. In the management of their local affairs the various churches, charges, circuits or congregations of the negotiating Churches shall be entitled to continue the organization and practices (including those practices relating to membership, church ordinances, Sunday Schools and Young People's Societies) enjoyed by them at the time of the union, subject in general affairs to the legislation, principles and discipline of The United Church. Their representatives in the next higher governing body or court shall be chosen as at present.

5. The plan of organization prescribed for pastoral charges to be formed subsequent to the union may at any time be adopted by any church, charge, circuit or congregation existing at the time of the union.

6. Subject to the provisions of the next succeeding paragraph hereof, all property, real and personal, under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada held in trust for or to the use of a church, charge, circuit or congregation of any of the negotiating Churches, shall be held by trustees appointed by or on behalf of such church, charge, circuit or congregation, upon trusts set forth and declared in a Model Trust Deed. This Model Trust Deed should be a schedule to the Act, and should contain, among others, a provision to the following effect: That the property is held for the church, charge, circuit or congregation as a part of The United Church, and that no property so held shall be sold, exchanged, or in any manner encumbered, unless the Presbytery shall, at the instance of the church, charge, circuit or congregation, have given its sanction, subject to an appeal, if desired, to the Conference.

7. Any property or funds owned by a church, charge, circuit or congregation at the time of the union solely for its own benefit, or vested in trustees for the sole benefit of such church, charge, circuit or congregation, and not for the denomination of which the said church, charge, circuit or congregation formed a part, shall not be affected by the legislation giving effect to the union or by any legislation of The United Church without the consent of the church, charge, circuit or congregation for which such property is held in trust.

8. Churches, charges, circuits, or congregations received, subsequent to the union, into The United Church, with the approval

of Presbyteries, shall be entitled, if they so desire, to the privileges of sections 4, 5 and 7.

(*b*)—*Charges to be formed subsequent to the Union.*

9. The liberty of the pastoral charge shall be recognized to the fullest extent compatible with:

(*a*) The oversight of the spiritual interests of the charge by the minister (or ministers) and a body of men specially chosen and set apart or ordained for that work, who shall jointly constitute the session;

(b) The efficient co-operation of the representatives of the various departments of the work of the charge by means of a meeting to be held at least quarterly;

(*c*) The hearty co-operation of the various pastoral charges in the general work of the Church, and

(*d*) The exercise by the higher governing bodies or courts of their powers and functions, hereinafter set forth.

10. New pastoral charges or local churches shall be formed with the consent of a Presbytery by persons residing within its bounds, who declare their adherence to the principles of The United Church, and their desire for the formation of such charge or church. Missions may be organized as pastoral charges by Presbytery of its own motion, or on the suggestion of the Missionary Superintendent or the Minister, under such regulations as the General Council may pass.

Before sanctioning the formation of a pastoral charge or local church, the Presbytery shall be required to hear and consider the representations of any pastoral charge that may be affected by the proposed action.

11. (*a*) The members of the Church entitled to all church privileges are those who, on a profession of their faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him, have been received into full membership. The children of such persons and all baptized children are members of the Church, and it is their duty and privilege, when they reach the age of discretion, to enter into full membership. Admission to full membership, and granting of certificates of removal, shall be by the action of the session, and by the action of those in full membership where desired by the pastoral charge.

(*b*) The members of a local church who are entitled to vote at all meetings are persons in full membership, whose names are on the roll of the church. With the consent of these, adherents who contribute regularly to the support of the church may vote on temporal matters.

12. The members of a local church shall meet annually, and more frequently if they deem it advisable.

13. The Session shall have oversight of the spiritual interests of the pastoral charge. The management of its temporal and

financial affairs shall be entrusted to a Committee of Stewards. The Official Board, consisting of the Session and Committee of Stewards, with representatives in full church membership of such other departments of church work as may be agreed upon by the General Council, shall meet quarterly, and more frequently if they deem it advisable, for the consideration of matters of joint interest.

14. The members of the session, other than the minister, shall be chosen by those in full church membership, and shall hold office under regulations to be passed by the General Council.

15. (*a*) It shall be the duty of the session to have the oversight of:

(1) The admission of persons into full membership, and the granting of certificates of removal.

(2) The conduct of members, with power to exercise discipline.

(3) The administration of the sacraments.

(4) The religious training of the young, and the organization of meetings for Christian fellowship, instruction and work.

(5) The order of public worship, including the service of praise and the use of the church edifice.

(6) The care of the poor, and the visiting of the sick.

(*b*) It shall also be its duty:

(7) To receive and judge petitions, etc., from members.

(8) To transmit petitions, appeals, etc., to Presbytery.

(9) To recommend suitable laymen to Presbyteries for license to preach.

(10) To recommend suitable candidates for the ministry.

16. The stewards shall be chosen by the local church, and, wherever practicable, should be persons in full membership.

It shall be the duty of the Committee of Stewards to secure contributions for the purposes of the local church, and to disburse the moneys received for these purposes.

17. It shall be the duty of the Official Board:

(1) To secure contributions for missionary and other general objects of the Church.

(2) To select representatives, in full church membership, of the pastoral charge to the Presbytery.

(3) To submit to the pastoral charge or local church for its consideration reports on life and work, including a full statement of receipts and expenditures, of indebtedness and of estimates for the ensuing year.

(4) To transmit from the pastoral charge, through the Presbytery, to the Settlement Committee, representations concerning the pastoral relation.

(5) To attend to matters affecting the pastoral charge not assigned to any of the other bodies.

18. All lands, premises and property acquired for the use of a local church or a pastoral charge of The United Church, shall be held, used and administered under the trusts of the above Model Trust Deed. (See "Polity," par. 6).

III.—THE PRESBYTERY.

19. The Presbytery shall consist of:

(1) The ordained ministers within the bounds—

(*a*) Who are engaged in some department of church work; and

(*b*) Who have been placed on the roll by special enactment of the Conference in accordance with regulations to be made by the General Council.

(The rights to membership in Presbyteries, District Meetings, and Associations, enjoyed by ministers at the time of the union, shall be conserved.)

(2) The elders, deacons, leaders or other non-ministerial representatives of pastoral charges, within the bounds, equal in number to the number of ministers, and chosen in accordance with regulations to be made by the General Council.

20. It shall be the duty of the Presbytery:

(1) To have the oversight of the pastoral charges within its bounds, review their records, and form new pastoral charges, or local churches.

(2) To receive and dispose of petitions and appeals from the lower governing bodies or courts.

(3) To transmit petitions and appeals to the higher governing bodies or courts.

(4) To license as preachers laymen who are duly recommended and who after examinations are approved.

(5) To superintend the education of students looking forward to the ministry, and to certify them to theological colleges.

(6) To inquire, each year, into the personal character, doctrinal beliefs and general fitness of candidates for the ministry, recommended by sessions, official boards or local churches; and, when they have fulfilled the prescribed requirements, to license them to preach and to recommend them for the ordination of the Conference.

(7) To induct or install ministers.

(8) To deal with matters sent down by the higher governing bodies or courts.

(9) To adopt measures for promoting the religious life of the pastoral charges within its bounds.

(10) To select non-ministerial representatives to the Conference, of whom at least a majority shall have been previously chosen by pastoral charges to represent them in Presbyteries, and to nominate representatives on the Conference Settlement Committee.

(11) To have the oversight of the conduct of ministers within its bounds.

IV.—The Conference.

21. The Conference shall consist of the ministers on the rolls of the Presbyteries within its bounds, and an equal number of non-ministerial representatives of pastoral charges chosen as provided for in subsection 20 (par. 10).

22. It shall be the duty of the Conference:

(1) To meet every year.

(2) To determine the number and boundaries of the Presbyteries within its bounds, have oversight of them, and review their records.

(3) To receive and dispose of appeals and petitions, subject to the usual right of appeal.

(4) To see that, as far as possible, every pastoral charge within its bounds shall have a pastorate without interruption, and that every effective minister shall have a pastoral charge, and to effect this through a Settlement Committee which it shall appoint annually.

(5) To examine and ordain candidates for the ministry who have fulfilled the prescribed requirements and have been recommended by the Presbyteries.

(6) To receive ministers from other Churches subject to the regulations of the General Council.

(7) To deal with matters referred to it by the General Council.

(8) To select an equal number of ministerial and non-ministerial representatives to the General Council.

(9) To have oversight of the religious life of the Church within its bounds, and to adopt such measures as may be judged necessary for its promotion.

V.—The General Council.

23. The General Council shall consist of an equal number of ministers and non-ministerial representatives chosen by the Conferences. Its regular meeting shall be held every second year. Its presiding officer shall be the chief executive officer of the Church, and during his term of office he may be relieved of his pastoral or other duties.

24. The General Council shall have full power:

(1) To determine the number and boundaries of the Conferences, have oversight of them, and review their records.

(2) (*a*) To legislate on matters respecting the doctrine, worship, membership and government of the Church, subject to the conditions: First, that before any rule or law relative to these matters can become a permanent law, it must receive the approval of a majority of the Presbyteries, and, if advisable, pastoral charges also; Second, that no terms of admission to full member-

ship shall be described other than those laid down in the New Testament; and, Third, that the freedom of worship at present enjoyed in the negotiating Churches shall not be interfered with in The United Church.

(*b*) To legislate on all matters respecting property, subject to the limitations elsewhere provided in this Basis of Union, and subject also to the approval of the Conference in which the property is situated.

(3) To prescribe and regulate the course of study of candidates for the ministry and to regulate the admission of ministers from other Churches.

(4) To receive and dispose of petitions, memorials, etc.

(5) To dispose of appeals.

(6) To determine the missionary policy of the Church, and to provide for the conduct of its missions.

(7) To have charge of the colleges of the Church, and to take what measures are deemed advisable for the promotion of Christian education.

(8) To appoint committees or boards and officers for the different departments of church work, and to receive their reports and give them instructions and authority.

(9) To correspond with other Churches.

(10) And in general to enact such legislation and adopt such measures as may tend to promote true godliness, repress immorality, preserve the unity and well-being of the Church, and advance the kingdom of Christ throughout the world.

THE MINISTRY

I.—PASTORAL OFFICE, INCLUDING TERM OF SERVICE.

Recognizing the desirability of preserving the essence of both the settled pastorate and the itinerancy, the Joint Committee is of the opinion that a harmony of both principles is possible, and that the best features of both systems may be retained. We, therefore, recommend as follows:

1. The pastoral relation shall be without a time limit.

2. The policy of the Church shall be that every pastoral charge shall have, as far as possible, a pastorate without interruption, and that every effective minister shall have a pastoral charge.

3. There shall be for each Conference a Settlement Committee, consisting of ministers and laymen, and appointed annually by the Conference. On this Committee each Presbytery shall be represented. It shall be the duty of this Committee to consider all applications for settlement from ministers and pastoral charges within the district over which it has jurisdiction. For this purpose it shall meet annually before the meeting of the Conference next after that by which it was appointed.

4. A minister by his own action and a pastoral charge through its constitutional representatives may, by such a date before the annual meeting of the Settlement Committee as the General Council shall determine, seek a change of pastoral relation by means of an application through the Presbytery to the Settlement Committee. All such applications shall be in writing.

5. Any pastoral charge, in view of a vacancy, may extend a call or invitation to any properly qualified minister or ministers, but the right of appointment shall rest with the Settlement Committee, which shall report to the Conference for information only.

6. (*a*) When a pastoral charge about to become vacant at the end of the Conference year, fails to give a call or invitation within the time specified by the General Council, the Settlement Committee shall make the appointment.

(*b*) When a pastoral charge becomes vacant during the Conference year through death or other emergency, the Presbytery concerned shall confer with the charge itself or with its constitutional representatives, and thereafter may arrange a supply for the remainder of the Conference year.

7. The Settlement Committee shall also have authority to initiate correspondence with ministers and pastoral charges with a view to completing arrangements to secure necessary and desirable settlements.

(*a*) Any minister shall have the right to appear before the Settlement Committee to represent his case in regard to his appointment; and any pastoral charge or Official Board may also appear by not more than two representatives, properly authorized in writing, appointed from among its members at a regular meeting, or at a special meeting of which proper notice has been given:

(*b*) When a minister chosen by a pastoral charge cannot be settled, the charge or its constitutional representatives may place other names before the Settlement Committee:

(*c*) While the right of appointment shall rest with the Settlement Committee it shall comply as far as possible with the expressed wishes of ministers and pastoral charges.

8. There shall also be a committee for the transfer of ministers from one Conference to another, which may be composed of the presiding officer of the General Council of the Church, who shall be the convener and chairman of the committee, together with the presiding officers of the several Conferences. This committee shall have authority to transfer ministers and candidates for the ministry from one Conference to another, in harmony with the plan outlined in sections 3-7.

9. The minister in charge shall be the presiding officer of the Session and of the Official Board.

10. Every minister or candidate for the ministry, duly appointed regular pastor to a pastoral charge, shall have the right

to conduct services in the church, churches or other places of worship in connection with said charge; and the right of occupancy of the manse or parsonage in connection with said charge, subject, however, to the rules and regulations of The United Church.

II.—TRAINING FOR THE MINISTRY.

1. No candidate for the ministry shall be received unless he has been first recommended by a session, official board, or local church.

2. The duty of inquiry into the personal character, doctrinal beliefs, and general fitness of candidates for the ministry recommended by sessions, official boards or local churches, shall be laid upon the Presbytery and such inquiry shall be repeated each year until they are recommended to the Conference for ordination.

3. (1) The attainment of a B.A. degree including Greek, to be followed by three years in the study of Theology, is strongly recommended by the Church. Before ordination every candidate shall spend twelve months in preaching and pastoral work.

(2) In cases where the B.A. degree is unattainable, there shall be two alternative courses, both starting from University matriculation.

(*a*) Three years, at least, in Arts, followed by three years in Theology. Before ordination every candidate shall spend twelve months in preaching and pastoral work.

(*b*) Two years' preaching under the supervision of a Presbytery, with appropriate studies, and four years of a mixed Arts and Theological course in college.

4. *Suggested Curricula*:

(1) Course of study in Arts under (2) (*a*). English Language and Literature, three years. Two languages, one of which must be Greek, two years in each.

Philosophy, including Psychology, Logic and Ethics two years. Two other subjects from the Arts curriculum at the option of the student—one year in each.

(2) Course of study under (2) (*b*):

(*a*) While under supervision of Presbytery, and engaged in preaching for two years:

English Bible; New Testament in Greek; Elements of Theology—Life of Christ; History of Missions; English Literature; Practical Training, including preparation of sermons.

(*b*) Four years of mixed Arts and Theological Course in College.

The Arts Course.—English Language and Literature; Philosophy, including Psychology; Logic and Ethics; one language; any one option from the Arts Course.

Theological Course.—Homiletics; Pastoral Theology; Systematic Theology; New Testament Languages and Literature; Old

Testament Literature (English Bible); Church History; Christian Ethics and Sociology.

5. The following is suggested as a comprehensive course in Theology, from which may be selected subjects sufficient to constitute the three years' course in Theology as under 3 (1) and (2) (*a*):

Old Testament Language and Literature, including Textual Criticism. Exegesis, Biblical Theology, Introduction, Old Testament History and Old Testament Canon; New Testament Language and Literature, including Textual Criticism, Exegesis, Biblical Theology, Introduction, New Testament History and New Testament Canon; English Bible; Church History, including Symbolics; Systematic Theology; Apologetics, including Philosophy of Religion, History of Religion, and Comparative Religion; Christian Ethics and Sociology; Christian Missions; Practical Training, including preparation and delivery of sermons, preparation for and conduct of public worship, administration of the Sacraments, Church Law, the art of teaching and Sunday School work, public speaking and voice training. Practical Training is to be understood to include not only instruction in these subjects but actual drill wherever the subject admits of it.

6. Provision shall be made in the Theological Colleges for instruction in the subjects of the above suggested course in Theology as far as practicable.

7. In every College special attention shall be given to Practical Training as specified and described above.

8. From the above (5) comprehensive course in Theology the Church shall prescribe certain subjects as compulsory, leaving others to the option of the students in consultation with the College authorities.

9. Candidates for the ministry who have entered on their course in Theology shall be allowed to complete it on the conditions which obtained when they began, but this privilege shall expire within three years from the date of the union.

10. The General Council shall possess the power of ordaining any person to the ministry if it sees fit so to do.

III.—The Relations of a Minister to the Doctrines of the Church.

1. The duty of final inquiry into the personal character, doctrinal beliefs, and general fitness of candidates for the Ministry presenting themselves for ordination or for reception as ministers of The United Church, shall be laid upon the Conference.

2. These candidates shall be examined on the Statement of Doctrine of The United Church, and shall, before ordination, satisfy the examining body that they are in essential agreement therewith, and that as ministers of the Church they accept the

statement as in substance agreeable to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures.

3. Further, in the ordination service before the Conference these candidates shall answer the following questions:

(1) Do you believe yourself to be a child of God, through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ?

(2) Do you believe yourself to be called of God to the office of the Christian ministry, and your chief motives to be zeal for the glory of God, love for the Lord Jesus Christ, and desire for the salvation of men?

(3) Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrines required for eternal salvation in our Lord Jesus Christ, and are you resolved out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing which is not agreeable thereto?

ADMINISTRATION

The Joint Committee, after careful consideration of the Missionary, Educational and other connexional enterprises of the negotiating Churches, submits the following recommendations in relation thereto:

I.—Missions.

1. In the administration of the mission work of The United Church there shall be two departments: (*a*) Home, including all the mission work within the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland and the Bermudas; (*b*) Foreign, including the missions already established or that may be established in other countries.

2. For the oversight and administration of these two departments there shall be two Boards to be known as the Board of Home Missions and the Board of Foreign Missions, to be elected in such a manner and endowed with such powers as the General Council may determine.

3. In recognition of the very valuable services rendered by the Women's Missionary Societies, the union, constitution and lines of work of these societies shall be determined by the joint action of their Boards, subject to the approval of the General Council.

4. There shall be placed under the administration of the Home Mission Board of The United Church the moneys now administered under the caption of the Sustentation Fund, and Church and Parsonage Aid Fund of the Methodist Church; the Home Mission and Augmentation Funds, French Evangelization Fund, and Church and Manse Fund (except that under the Foreign Mission Board) of the Presbyterian Church; the Home Mission Fund of the Congregational Churches; and such portion of the Mission Fund now raised by the Methodist Church, and the Foreign

Mission Board of the Presbyterian Church, as is now expended in Canada, Newfoundland and the Bermudas.

5. There shall be placed under the administration of the Foreign Mission Board of The United Church the Foreign Mission Fund of the Congregational Churches and that portion of the Mission Fund of the Methodist Church and of the Foreign Mission Fund of the Presbyterian Church now expended in other lands.

6. There shall be placed under the administration of the Board of Social Service and Evangelism and the Board of Sunday Schools and Young People's Societies of The United Church the funds now raised for the work of the Departments of Social Service and Evangelism and the Departments of Sunday Schools and Young People's Societies of the negotiating churches.

7. Inasmuch as certain expenses in connection with the various courts of the Church will have to be met, the ways and means of raising these funds shall be left to the General Council.

II.—PUBLISHING INTERESTS.

It shall be left to the General Council of The United Church to determine how far the publications now issued by the negotiating Churches shall be amalgamated.*

III.—COLLEGES.

The Colleges at present connected with the negotiating Churches exist, each under its own charter, and in various relations to the respective Churches. These relations affect, first, the appointment of the Governing Board, second, the appointment of Professors in the Faculty of Theology; third, assistance or maintenance from funds controlled by the Church.

1. All the Colleges connected with the three negotiating Churches shall, as far as possible, sustain the same relation to

---

*The periodicals published by the Methodist Church are as follows: *Christian Guardian* (weekly), Toronto; *Epworth Era* (monthly), Toronto; *The Missionary Outlook* (monthly), Toronto; The *Wesleyan* (weekly), Halifax, and a Series of Sabbath School Illustrated Papers and Lesson Helps for Teachers and Scholars.

By the Presbyterian Church: *The Presbyterian Record* (monthly), Montreal; *The Presbyterian Witness,* (Weekly), Toronto, and a Series of Sabbath School Illustrated Papers and Lesson Helps for Teachers and Scholars.

The *Congregationalist,* a weekly paper, is published by the Publication Department of the Congregational Union of Canada.

The Methodist Church also possesses a printing plant, and carries on a general publishing business—"The Methodist Book Room," Toronto—the Eastern section of the Book Committee owning the property in Halifax in which the business is transacted.

The relation of the publishing interests of the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches to their respective Churches and the general methods of management are similar in each case, save that in the case of the Methodist Book concern, allocation of profits is made to the Superannuation Fund.

The United Church as, under their charter, they now sustain to the respective churches, until the General Council shall determine otherwise and necessary legislation shall give effect to changes made thereby.

2. The policy of the Church shall be the maintenance of a limited number of thoroughly equipped Colleges, due regard being paid to the needs of different parts of the country, and in furtherance of this policy amalgamation shall be effected as soon as possible in localities where two or more Colleges are doing the same class of work.

3. In addition to the Governing Boards of the several Colleges there shall be appointed by the General Council a Board of Education, which shall have such a general oversight of the Educational interests of the Church as the General Council may assign to it, and carry out such measures as may be decided in reference thereto.

4. There shall be a general Educational Fund, administered by the Board of Education, for the purpose of supplementing the revenues of the several colleges and assisting students in their preparation for the ministry, and for such other purposes and under such regulations as the General Council may from time to time determine.

5. The several educational institutions shall be encouraged to obtain permanent endowments for their maintenance, may receive contributions for this and other purposes at any time, and, upon receiving the consent of the Board of Education, may proceed to appeal for such funds.

IV.—Benevolent Funds.

Whereas there exist, in some form, in all the negotiating Churches funds to aid aged and retired ministers, and widows and orphans of ministers, provision for similar purposes shall be made in the constitution of The United Church by such amalgamation or modification of existing methods as may be found practicable; and such provision shall embrace the following particulars:

1. The rights of present and prospective claimants on existing funds in any of the negotiating churches shall be adequately protected. To this end:

(1) The present capital investments of the various benevolent funds of the negotiating Churches, and the income now contributed to those funds by publishing interests shall be combined into a "common trust," if practicable. The rights of present claimants and of prospective claimants (the latter being computed as of the date of the union) shall be a first charge on the revenue from this trust. If it be found that differences in the constitution and administration of the several funds are such as to necessitate separate trusts, instead of a common trust, this shall not be a bar

to the carrying out of the general plan, because in that case their revenues shall be combined.

(2) The General Council of The United Church shall provide for (*a*) the assessing of each minister who is a member of any of the existing funds at the date of the union and of all ministers received into or ordained in The United Church after the union, on the basis of stipend or age, or both stipend and age, as the General Council may determine, and (*b*) the collecting of contributions, which shall be obligatory upon all local churches, based upon an equitable allocation or assessment under the rules to be formulated by the General Council, the minimum of such allocation or assessment being the amount which, together with the revenue from said trust or trusts and the foregoing assessment upon ministers, is requisite to make good the claims of claimants upon the Superannuation Fund to be instituted by the General Council.

2. Claimants on the proposed Fund shall include the following:

(*a*) All ministers who, at the time of the union, are beneficiaries of existing funds.

(*b*) All ministers who, at the time of the union, are regular contributors to existing funds on the scale provided by their respective denominations.

(*c*) All ministers' widows and orphans who are now, or may hereafter become, entitled to participate in the proposed Fund.

(*d*) All ministers, not members of or contributors to existing funds, who may signify their desire to become members of and contributors to the proposed Fund, on the basis of payments sanctioned by the General Council of The United Church.

Provision shall be made whereby ministers so applying may, by a certain scale of payments, be entitled to have their claim upon the proposed Fund date from the time of their reception into the ministry of any of the negotiating Churches instead of from the date of the union.

(*e*) All ministers received into or ordained in the Church after the union inasmuch as they shall be required at the time of their reception or ordination to become members of and contributors to the proposed Fund.

3. The sources of revenue of the proposed Fund shall be the following:

(*a*) Contributions of ministers who are members of said Fund at its inception, or afterwards become such, on a scale to be adopted by the General Council of the Church.

(*b*) Offerings in all local Churches based upon an equitable allocation to be made by the Board of Management of said Fund, under regulations sanctioned by the General Council.

(*c*) Legacies and donations given for the purpose.

(*d*) Such grants from the profits of the publishing interests of the Church as may from time to time be determined under regulations to be framed by the General Council.

(*e*) Proceeds of any investments that may be made in the interests of the said Fund.

APPENDIX ON LAW

1. When a Basis of Union has been agreed upon by the negotiating Churches, the union should be consummated and The United Church incorporated by a Special Act of the Parliament of Canada.

2. The Act of the Parliament of Canada consummating the Union and incorporating The United Church should contain, among others, provisions to the following effect:

(1) Ratifying and confirming the Basis of Union as agreed upon, and empowering The United Church to acquire and hold property.

(2) Making clear (*a*) that The United Church shall have the powers of legislation mentioned in sub-paragraph (2) of paragraph 24 of the Polity Section of the Basis of Union, subject to the safeguards thereby imposed, in such full and ample manner as to render impossible the existence in connection with The United Church of the conditions which have arisen in Scotland in connection with The United Free Church of Scotland, under the decision of the House of Lords, touching its property and doctrine.

(*b*) That all the estate, real and personal, belonging to or held in trust for or to the use of the negotiating Churches, or belonging to or held in trust for or to the use of any corporation under the government or control of, or in connection with, any of the said negotiating Churches, shall be vested in The United Church or in Boards, Committees or Corporations under the control thereof, and shall be used and administered in accordance with the terms and provisions of the Basis of Union.*

(*c*) That, subject to the provisions of the next succeeding paragraph hereof, all property, real and personal, under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada held in trust for or to the use of a church, charge, circuit or congregation of any of the negotiating Churches, shall be held by trustees appointed by or on behalf of such church, charge, circuit or congregation, upon trusts set forth and declared in a Model Trust Deed.

This Model Trust Deed should be a schedule to the Act, and should contain, among others a provision to the following effect:

---

*At a meeting of the Presbyterian Union Committee held on December 15th, 1914, it was resolved that "it is expected that in the proposed legislation proper provision will be made to guard the rights or privileges of any minority which may be opposed to Union."

That the property is held for the Church, charge, circuit or congregation as a part of The United Church, and that no property so held shall be sold, exchanged, or in any manner encumbered unless the Presbytery shall, at the instance of the Church, charge, circuit or congregation, have given its sanction, subject to an appeal, if desired, to the Conference.

(*d*) That any property or funds owned by a church, charge, circuit or congregation at the time of the union solely for its own benefit, or vested in trustees for the sole benefit of such church, charge, circuit or congregation, and not for the denomination of which the said church, charge, circuit or congregation formed a part, shall not be affected by the legislation giving effect to the union or by any legislation of The United Church without the consent of the church, charge, circuit or congregation for which said property is held in trust.

Note.—To avoid uncertainty as to title, all churches, charges, circuits or congregations coming within the provision of this clause should be named in a schedule attached to the Act, and the provisions of this section should be limited to the churches, charges, circuits or congregations so enumerated in the schedule.

Note.—This provision would cover all property which might be properly described as denominational property.

(*e*) That all lands, premises and property acquired for the use of a local church or a pastoral charge of The United Church shall be held, used and administered upon the trusts of the said Model Trust Deed above referred to.

3. Special acts of the Legislatures of the several Provinces of the Dominion and of Newfoundland and the Bermudas and any other country in which the negotiating Churches hold property should be obtained, containing similar provisions and vesting in the manner above indicated the above and like classes of property and interests over which the said Legislatures may respectively have jurisdiction, and rendering effective in the said several jurisdictions the other provisions relating to the said union.

Appendix VI.

A STATEMENT OF FAITH

A Declaration of The National Congregational Council of 1913. (U.S.A.)

We believe in God the Father, infinite in wisdom, goodness and love; and in Jesus Christ, his Son, our Lord and Saviour, who for us and our salvation lived and died and rose again, and liveth evermore; and in the Holy Spirit, who taketh of the things of Christ and revealeth them to us, renewing, comforting, and inspiring the souls of men.

We are united in striving to know the will of God as taught in the Holy Scriptures, and in our purpose to walk in the ways of the Lord, made known or to be made known to us.

We hold it to be the mission of the Church of Christ to proclaim the gospel to all mankind, exalting the worship of the one true God, and laboring for the progress of knowledge, the promotion of justice, the reign of peace, and the realization of human brotherhood.

Depending, as did our fathers, upon the continued guidance of the Holy Spirit to lead us into all truth, we work and pray for the transformation of the world into the Kingdom of God; and we look with faith for the triumph of righteousness and the life everlasting.

Appendix VII.

BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE CHURCH'S FAITH
(UNITED FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, 1921.)

What follows is a brief expression, in terms of present-day thought, of the great Christian certainties and of the Christian ideal of human life.

I.—CONCERNING GOD.

We believe in one Almighty God, Creator of all things, Father of all men, only Ruler and Judge of the world, holy and wise and loving. We believe it is His will that men should know Him; and through the life, death, and victory of the Lord Jesus Christ we have learned that God loves men, seeks their good, bears all their sorrows, suffers for their sins, and will triumph in His glorious purpose over all evil at the last.

II.—CONCERNING THE LORD JESUS CHRIST.

We believe that God so loved the world that He gave His Son to be the Saviour of mankind. We believe that this very Son of God, for us men and for our salvation, became man in Jesus Christ, Who, having lived on earth the perfect human life, devoted wholly to the will of God and the service of man, died for our sins, rose again from the dead, and is now exalted Lord over all.

We believe that Jesus Christ is the Revealer of the Father, and that the mind of God towards the world must in all things be interpreted by the mind of Christ. We believe that when in our experience we are brought face to face with Jesus Christ we are in the presence of the eternal and holy God.

Therefore, with the Church of all ages, we worship Him together with the Father.

III.—CONCERNING THE HOLY SPIRIT.

We believe that God through His Spirit is ever present in the lives of men, seeking them for Himself, rebuking their sinfulness, inspiring every right desire, and every effort after truth. We believe that all who seek God through Jesus Christ may in the Spirit have communion with Him by obedience, by prayer, and by the fellowship and Sacraments of the Church; and that by the same Spirit power is granted to all who ask it, giving them victory over sin, and transforming them into the likeness of Christ.

IV.—CONCERNING THE HOLY TRINITY.

Thus knowing God through Jesus Christ His Son, and through the working of His Spirit in our lives, we acknowledge and adore one God—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

V.—Concerning Providence.

We believe, in face of the mysteries of an unfinished world, that God orders all things for perfectly wise and loving ends, that He has every human life in His gracious and holy keeping, and will never forsake the work of His own hands. Inasmuch as He has given to men freedom of will, He is not responsible for their sins or for the miseries that come to these. Yet He is not defeated by our evil doings, but overrules all events for the furtherance of His supreme designs of good.

VI.—Concerning the Kingdom of God.

We believe that the unchangeable purpose of God is the establishing and perfecting of His Kingdom—a society ruled in all parts by love and righteousness, a society of which Christ is King, and to which all belong who are themselves animated by His Spirit.

We believe that the Kingdom of God is already among us, and that the appointed task of all good men is to advance it, and to bring every relation of human life under the dominion of Christ. We believe that Christ is the true and only Lord of all mankind, and that those who confess Him are bound to make Him known till all the world acknowledge Him as Lord and King.

We believe that the Kingdom of God will finally dominate the life of man, and that in the world to come God will complete and perfect it, the Lord Jesus Christ being manifested in power and great glory.

VII.—Concerning the Church.

We believe that, as Jesus Christ gathered and still gathers round Him a fellowship of faith and love, it is His will that those who through Him believe in God should unite in a visible Church. We believe it to be His purpose that, through their common life of worship and service, they may learn to be like Him in faith, hope, and love, further the ends of His Kingdom, proclaim His Gospel to all mankind, and be His fellow-workers in combating ignorance, pride and covetousness, vice and disease, and every social injustice and public wrong.

We believe that the Catholic or Universal Church is the whole company of the redeemed, and we recognize as belonging to this fellowship all who are united to God through faith in Christ.

Of the visible Church, and every branch thereof, the only Head is the Lord Jesus Christ; and in its faith, order, discipline, and duty, it must be free to obey His holy will.

We receive, as Divine gifts to the Church, the Holy Scriptures and the Sacraments of the New Testament. We believe that through these Sacraments—Baptism and the Lord's Supper—

received with faith, there are conveyed to men the blessings of salvation.

VIII.—Concerning the Holy Scriptures.

We believe that God has revealed Himself in nature, conscience, and history, so that never in any nation has He left Himself without witness. Yet the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments record a clear and ever-growing revelation of God as faithfully and unchangeably Redeemer, which is made complete in Christ; they therefore contain, in a supreme sense, the Word of God, and are needful for the full understanding of His purpose, for reconciliation with Him, and for life according to His will. Of this we are convinced by the witness of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of men to and with the Word; and the Spirit of God, thus speaking from the Scriptures to believers and to the Church, is the supreme authority by which all opinions in religion are finally to be judged.

IX.—Concerning Sin.

We believe that the sin of man was no part of the purpose of God; yet that all men are sinful, and that each of us has been guilty of wilful and repeated sin. We acknowledge that sin separates men from God, and brings them under His condemnation and punishment: and that without His forgiveness and His patient and mighty help no man can deliver himself from either the guilt or the power of his sin.

X.—Concerning the Saving Love of God.

We believe that from the beginning God has been patiently seeking the redemption of His children, and that through prophet and psalmist He made it clear that there is forgiveness with Him. But we believe that His eternal purpose to redeem has been fully made known in Jesus Christ, in Whom God Himself came among men to seek and to save that which is lost, and that in the death on the Cross He has shown us the malignity of sin and His antagonism thereto, but, above all, His love in putting away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.

Therefore, with thankful devotion, we find in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ the assurance of God's forgiving grace, and learn that His holy love can only be satisfied with a holy life in those whom He forgives.

We believe that we are received into sonship and peace with God, not because of any good works or holiness on our part, as though we could deserve so great salvation, but only and altogether because of His infinite mercy, freely granted to all who repent and turn from their sins, and accept Jesus Christ as their Saviour and Lord.

XI.—Concerning Christian Sonship.

We believe that all who receive the Gospel are called and enabled to live in fellowship with God as His children, to keep

His commandments, to grow in knowledge of His love, and to trust His fatherly care in every trial and perplexity, thereby in their whole life showing themselves thankful to God for all His gifts.

XII.—CONCERNING THE LIFE TO COME.

We believe that after death the soul continues to live, in the just and merciful keeping of Almighty God, who will give to it a body as it pleases Him.

We believe that He, Who alone can read the heart, will judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ, and that wickedness will not go unpunished. We believe that those who accept the mercy of God will in His fellowship go on towards perfect holiness and blessedness. And, with glad and solemn hearts, we look for the consummation and bliss of the life everlasting, wherein the people of God, freed for ever from sin and sorrow, shall serve Him in the perfected communion of saints.

These things, as all else in our Christian faith, we hold in reverent submission to the guidance and teaching of the Holy Spirit Who is truth, and we shall ever seek of Him enlightenment and grace both to unlearn our errors and also more fully to learn the mind and will of God, to Whom be glory for ever and ever.

Appendix VIII.

LAMBETH APPEAL (1920), AND RESOLUTIONS X-XIV.

We, Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England, in Conference assembled, realizing the responsibility which rests upon us at this time, and sensible of the sympathy and the prayers of many, both within and without our own Communion, make this appeal to all Christian people.

We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body. We believe that the Holy Spirit has called us in a very solemn and special manner to associate ourselves in penitence and prayer with all those who deplore the divisions of Christian people, and are inspired by the vision and hope of a visible unity of the whole Church.

I. We believe that God wills fellowship. By God's own act this fellowship was made in and through Jesus Christ, and its life is in His Spirit. We believe that it is God's purpose to manifest this fellowship, so far as this world is concerned, in an outward, visible, and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognized officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the Kingdom of God. This is what we mean by the Catholic Church.

II. This united fellowship is not visibly in the world to-day. On the one hand there are other ancient episcopal Communions in East and West, to whom ours is bound by many ties of common faith and tradition. On the other hand there are the great non-episcopal Communions, standing for rich elements of truth, liberty, and life which might otherwise have been obscured or neglected. With them we are closely linked by many affinities, racial, historical, and spiritual. We cherish the earnest hope that all these Communions, and our own, may be led by the Spirit into the unity of the Faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God. But in fact we are all organized in different groups, each one keeping to itself gifts that rightly belong to the whole fellowship, and tending to live its own life apart from the rest.

III. The causes of division lie deep in the past, and are by no means simply or wholly blameworthy. Yet none can doubt that self-will, ambition, and lack of charity among Christians have been principal factors in the mingled process, and that these, together with blindness to the sin of disunion, are still mainly responsible for the breaches of Christendom. We acknowledge this condition of broken fellowship to be contrary to God's will, and we desire frankly to confess our share in the guilt of thus crippling the Body of Christ and hindering the activity of His Spirit.

IV. The times call us to a new outlook and new measures. The Faith cannot be adequately apprehended and the battle of the Kingdom cannot be worthily fought while the body is divided, and is thus unable to grow up into the fulness of the life of Christ. The time has come, we believe, for all the separated groups of Christians to agree in forgetting the things which are behind and reaching out towards the goal of a reunited Catholic Church. The removal of the barriers which have arisen between them will only be brought about by a new comradeship of those whose faces are definitely set this way.

The vision which rises before us is that of a Church genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship "all who profess and call themselves Christians," within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ. Within this unity Christian Communions now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled.

V. This means an adventure of good will and still more of faith, for nothing less is required than a new discovery of the creative resources of God. To this adventure we are convinced that God is now calling all the members of His Church.

VI. We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of:

> The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief:
>
> The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ:
>
> A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.

VII. May we not reasonably claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry? It is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communions which do not possess the Episcopate. On the contrary we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace. But we submit that considerations alike of history and of present experience justify the claim which we make on behalf of the Episcopate. Moreover, we would urge that it is now and will prove to be in the future the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church. But we greatly desire that the office of a Bishop should be everywhere exercised in a representative and constitutional manner, and more truly express all that ought to be involved for the life of the Christian Family in the title of Father-in-God. Nay more, we eagerly look forward to the day when through its acceptance in a united Church we may all share in that grace which is pledged to the members of the whole body in the apostolic rite of the laying-on of hands, and in the joy and fellowship of a Eucharist in which as one Family we may together, without any doubtfulness of mind, offer to the one Lord our worship and service.

VIII. We believe that for all, the truly equitable approach to union is by the way of mutual deference to one another's consciences. To this end, we who send forth this appeal would say that if the authorities of other Communions should so desire, we are persuaded that, terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, Bishops and clergy of our Communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life. It is not in our power to know how far this suggestion may be acceptable to those to whom we offer it. We can only say that we offer it in all sincerity as a token of our longing that all ministries of grace, theirs and ours, shall be available for the service of our Lord in a united Church.

It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission through episcopal ordination, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship.

In so acting no one of us could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry. God forbid that any man should repudiate a past experience rich in spiritual blessings for himself and others. Nor would any of us be dishonoring the Holy Spirit of God Whose call led us all to our several ministries, and Whose power enabled us to perform them. We shall be publicly and formally seeking additional recognition of a new call to wider service in a reunited Church, and imploring for ourselves God's grace and strength to fulfil the same.

IX. The spiritual leadership of the Catholic Church in days to come, for which the world is manifestly waiting, depends upon the readiness with which each group is prepared to make sacrifices for the sake of a common fellowship, a common ministry, and a common service to the world.

We place this ideal first and foremost before ourselves and our own people. We call upon them to make the effort to meet the demands of a new age with a new outlook. To all other Christian people whom our words may reach we make the same appeal. We do not ask that any one Communion should consent to be absorbed in another. We do ask that all should unite in a new and great endeavor to recover and to manifest to the world the unity of the Body of Christ for which He prayed.

"10. The Conference recommends to the authorities of the Churches of the Anglican Communion that they should, in such ways and at such times as they think best, formally invite the authorities of other Churches within their areas to confer with them concerning the possibility of taking definite steps to co-operate in a common endeavor, on the lines set forth in the above Appeal, to restore the unity of the Church of Christ.

"11. The Conference recognizes that the task of effecting union with other Christian Communions must be undertaken by the various national, regional, or provincial authorities of the Churches within the Anglican Communion, and confidently commits to them the carrying out of this task on lines that are in general harmony with the principles underlying its Appeal and Resolutions.

"12. The Conference approves the following statements as representing the counsel which it is prepared to give to the Bishops, Clergy, and other members of our own Communion on various subjects which bear upon the problems of reunion, provided that such counsel is not to be regarded as calling in question any Canons or official declarations of any Synod or House of Bishops of a national, regional, or provincial Church which has already dealt with these matters.

"(A) In view of prospects and projects of reunion—

"(i) A Bishop is justified in giving occasional authorization to ministers, not episcopally ordained, who in his judgment are working towards an ideal of union such as is described in our Appeal, to preach in churches within his Diocese, and to clergy of the Diocese to preach in the churches of such ministers:

"(ii) The Bishops of the Anglican Communion will not question the action of any Bishop who, in the few years between the initiation and the completion of a definite scheme of union, shall countenance the irregularity of admitting to Communion the baptized but unconfirmed communicants of the non-episcopal congregations concerned in the scheme:

"(iii) The Conference gives its general approval to the suggestions contained in the report of the Sub-Committee on Reunion with Non-Episcopal Churches in reference to the status and work of ministers who may remain after union without episcopal ordination.

"(B) Believing, however, that certain lines of action might imperil both the attainment of its ideal and the unity of its own Communion, the Conference declares that:—

"(i) It cannot approve of general schemes of intercommunion or exchange of pulpits:

"(ii) In accordance with the principle of Church order set forth in the Preface to the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer, it cannot approve the celebration in Anglican churches of the Holy Communion for members of the Anglican Church by ministers who have not been episcopally ordained: and that it should be regarded as the general rules of the Church that Anglican communicants should receive Holy Communion only at the hands of ministers of their own Church, or of Churches in communion therewith.

"(C) In view of doubts and varieties of practice which have caused difficulties in the past, the Conference declares that:

"(i) Nothing in these Resolutions is intended to indicate that the rule of Confirmation as conditioning admission to the Holy Communion must necessarily apply to the case of baptized persons who seek Communion under conditions which in the Bishop's judgment justify their admission thereto.

"(ii) In cases in which it is impossible for the Bishop's judgment to be obtained beforehand, the priest should remember that he has no canonical authority to refuse Communion to any baptized person kneeling before the Lord's Table (unless he be excommunicate by name, or, in the canonical sense of the term, a cause of scandal to the faithful); and that, if a question may properly be raised as to the future admission of any such person to Holy Communion, either because he has not been confirmed or for other reasons, the priest should refer the matter to the Bishop for counsel or direction.

"13. The Conference recommends that, wherever it has not already been done, Councils representing all Christian Communions should be formed within such areas as may be deemed most convenient, as centres of united effort to promote the physical, moral, and social welfare of the people, and the extension of the rule of Christ among all nations and over every region of human life.

"14. It is important to the cause of reunion that every branch of the Anglican Communion should develop the constitutional government of the Church and should make a fuller use of the capacities of its members for service."

Appendix IX.

THE PROPOSED ENABLING LEGISLATION

(*a*) LETTER OF TRANSMISSION.
(*b*) REPORT OF COUNSEL RE CHURCH UNION.
(*c*) PROPOSED DOMINION LEGISLATION.
(*d*) MODEL TRUST DEED.
(*e*) PROPOSED PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION.
(*f*) REPORT OF UNION COMMITTEE OF THE METHODIST CHURCH.

(*a*) LETTER OF TRANSMISSION.

TORONTO, September 28th, 1922.

REV. J. H. EDMISON, D.D.
REV. T. ALBERT MOORE, D.D.
REV. W. H. WARRINER, D.D.
Secretaries of the Joint Committee on Church Union.

Dear Sirs:—

I beg to transmit to you herewith the following documents:—

1. Draft bill for the incorporation of the United Church of Canada.
2. Draft Provincial legislation.
3. Report dated Sept. 28, 1922, on the proposed legislation, from Gershom W. Mason, K.C., and McGregor Young, K.C., counsel for the Joint Committee.

These bills, in their present form, embody the amendments made in the original draft by the Committee on Law and Legislation to give effect to the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Church Union at its meeting on Sept. 22, 1922.

These amendments are in the form recommended by counsel for the Committee and have been approved by the Joint Committee on Law and Legislation through its Sub-Committee appointed for such purpose. The report of counsel enclosed explains the proposed bill and gives the reason for the amendments made.

May I respectfully suggest that you forward a copy of counsel's report with these bills to the Supreme Courts of the negotiating Churches?

Yours very truly,
N. W. ROWELL,
Chairman of the Joint Committee on Law and Legislation.
TORONTO, September 28th, 1922.

(b) REPORT OF COUNSEL RE CHURCH UNION.

HON. N. W. ROWELL, K. C.
Chairman,
Sub-Committee on Law and Legislation,
38 King Street West, Toronto.

Dear Sir:—

Re—CHURCH UNION

Pursuant to the instructions set out in your letter of the 26th of June last, we have considered the legislation required to give effect to the union of the negotiating churches and have prepared for submission to the Parliament of Canada and the Legislatures of the various provinces of Canada the bills which we think necessary for that purpose. These bills and a form of Model Trust Deed have been already sent to you.

The Dominion Bill provides for the incorporation of the United Church of Canada and vests in the United Church such property and funds as are under the legislative control of Parliament and gives it power to acquire, hold and administer the property, funds and schemes received from the three churches.

The Provincial Bills provide, subject to certain limitations therein set out, that the property of the congregations of the negotiating churches shall vest in the trustees of such congregations as a part of the United Church upon the trusts set out in the Model Trust Deed and that other property of the negotiating churches within the jurisdiction of the provinces shall vest in the United Church. They also provide for the exercise by the United Church of civil rights within the provinces and confirm and supplement the provisions of the Dominion Bill so as to enable the United Church to exercise within the provinces all the powers intended to be conferred upon it by its Act of Incorporation.

In preparing the legislation many questions have arisen with which we will deal in the order in which their subject matter arises in the Dominion Bill.

1. DEFINITIONS.

The differences in the constitution and organization of the negotiating Churches have made it advisable to set out a number of definitions in section 2 in order that all their respective associated and subsidiary corporations, boards, committees and other bodies, with their respective assets and interests, should be duly brought into the United Church. The Presbyterian Church in Canada is not incorporated. The Methodist Church was incorporated by an Act of the Parliament of Canada in the year 1884. The Congregational Churches are separate autonomous units and there is no governing body having legislative or administrative authority in relation to them. In the absence of incorporation the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches have found it expedient to incorporate a number of boards and committees to administer their affairs. We have, therefore, set out all these corporate bodies in connection with the Presbyterian Church in Canada in section 2 (c) and those in connection with the Congregational denomination in section 2 (g).

The corresponding definitions in the Provincial Bills are varied to cover the respective corporate bodies within the jurisdiction of the several provinces. The only body of this kind in connection with the Methodist Church thus far known to us is the Methodist Union of Toronto which we have included in the definition of the Methodist Church in the Ontario bill.

It appears that there are other corporate bodies connected with the negotiating churches, and their names are to be included in subsections (e), (f), and (g), respectively, when furnished by the respective Committees on Church Union.

Furthermore, many congregations, especially in the Maritime Provinces, have been separately incorporated, in some cases by special Acts and in others under the provisions of general Acts relating to religious societies. The definitions include all such incorporated congregations and all other congregations howsoever organized.

The expression "the negotiating churches" has been extended by definition to include the local union churches in their various forms as reported to us.

2. INCORPORATION.

In section 3 spaces are left in which to insert the names of the persons who may be the presiding officers of the various bodies when the bill is presented to Parliament.

The concluding words of this section "and the negotiating churches are hereby united and merged in the United Church" do not appear in the first printed draft of the bill and were not passed upon by the Union Committee. In our view the Basis of Union and the bill as approved by the Union Committee provide for a union of the negotiating churches, and upon the passing of the Act these churches would cease to exist. We think it advisable, however, to use express terms for the purpose of giving greater clearness to the intention of the Act, and we, therefore, recommend that the words above-mentioned be added to the section. The Methodist Church is a body corporate and there are many corporate bodies in connection with the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches and the addition of this language will make it clear that all such corporations become legally merged in the United Church.

3. GENERAL PROPERTY.

All the general property of the negotiating churches is vested by section 4 in the United Church. As we are informed that the local union churches have no general property, no reference is made to them in this section. The property so vested is to be held, used and administered subject to the provisions of the Act in accordance with the terms and provisions of the Basis of Union and subject to later provisions contained in the Act.

4. MODEL TRUST DEED.

Section 5 provides that congregational property shall be held for congregations as a part of the United Church upon the trusts set forth in schedule "B" (the Model Trust Deed.) The forms of conveyance and systems of land tenure differ in various provinces and we have thought it convenient, accordingly, that only the trusts, which can be made uniform in all the provinces, should be set out in the schedule.

There are several matters in connection with the Trust Deed to which we direct attention.

(*a*) With the object of making the conveyances to trustees less cumbrous, by the omission therefrom of the full language of the trusts, a short form of deed has been prepared in accordance with a common practice whereby the short form of words set out in a conveyance has the meaning and effect of the extended language contained in the second column of the Model Trust Deed. The full language of the trusts will always be available in the publications of the United Church.

Provision has been made in the Provincial Bills for simplifying registration in Registry Offices and Land Titles Offices.

(*b*) Special attention should be given to the provisions relating to the election and number of trustees. In the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches vacancies in boards of trustees are filled by election by the congregation. In the Methodist Church they are filled by the remaining trustees. The Trust Deed provides for election by the congregation. Existing trustees are continued but as vacancies occur they are to be filled by the congregation at a meeting specially called for the purpose.

Provision has also been made for the removal of trustees by a congregation, but only by a two-thirds majority of the members of the congregation present at the meeting. A trustee who is personally liable in respect of a debt on congregational property cannot be removed without his consent unless indemnified to his satisfaction in respect of such liability. The minimum number of trustees has been placed at three and the maximum at fifteen. In the Methodist Church the minimum number is five and the maximum twenty-one. It is deemed advisable to fix the minimum number at three because of the difficulties sometimes experienced in securing a sufficient number of trustees, and we think that fifteen is a sufficient maximum. Where, however, existing boards are composed of fifteen members no change will be made except that as vacancies occur they will not be filled until the number of trustees is reduced to below fifteen, after which fifteen will be the maximum.

(*c*) Provision is made that manses and parsonages are to be free from rent.

(*d*) The provision made for the uses to which church edifices may be put is wider than that appearing in the Model Trust Deed of any of the negotiating churches, the intention being to meet local needs as far as possible and yet maintain the primary character of the buildings as places for worship.

5. SPECIAL CONGREGATIONAL PROPERTY.

Section 7 incorporates the provision in the Basis of Union that congregations owning specific property at the time of union solely for their own benefit and not for the denomination of which they are a part may continue to hold such property unaffected by this legislation. We have adopted the suggestion made in the Appendix on Law that all congregations coming within the scope of this section should be named in a schedule attached to the Bill. We assume that the negotiating churches will take the necessary steps to bring this section to the attention of the proper authorities in order that this schedule may be prepared in ample time and upon proper information. The schedule is also to set out specifically the property affected and before it can be prepared it will be necessary to have satisfactory evidence that such property is in fact the property of the congregation and is not held for the denomination of which it forms a part.

6. LIABILITY FOR DEBTS.

Section 11 has been amended in accordance with instructions received from the Union Committee. The effect of the section is that congregational property remains liable for the payment of debts incurred in respect thereto to the same extent as if the Act had not been passed, but the United Church, as such, does not assume any liability for such debts. The general indebtedness of the uniting churches and their various boards and organizations is assumed by the United Church.

7. COLLEGES.

The Basis of Union provides that all the colleges "shall, as far as possible, sustain the same relation to the United Church as, under their charter, they now sustain to the respective churches, until the General Council shall determine otherwise and necessary legislation shall give effect to changes made thereby." We have, therefore, by section 12 excluded the property of colleges from the provisions of section 4 and have made no provision for any change of ownership of such property. Speaking generally, the control of the churches over their colleges is exercised through the appointment of governing bodies of the colleges by certain church courts. In the Presbyterian Church the powers of nomination are usually exercised by the General Assembly, and, in the Methodist Church, by the General Conference, but there are exceptional cases in which the powers of nomination are exercised by particular synods or conferences or by certain officers of synods, and there is one case (Morrin College) in which such powers are exercised by a particular congregation and its minister. Under section 12 all the powers of governing courts in respect of the colleges are vested in the General Council with power to vest the same in courts of the United Church as and to the extent it may deem expedient. Any existing legislation relating to the colleges is not affected except in so far as may be necessary to give effect to the new legislation.

Many statutes and trusts relating to the negotiating churches make special reference to the particular doctrines and religious standards to be taught and maintained in connection with the respective colleges and churches. Sections 13 and 14 are intended to take care of the legal difficulties that might arise if these matters were not covered by special legislation.

8. PROPERTY OUTSIDE CANADA.

It is not within the competence of either the Parliament of Canada or the Legislatures of the Provinces to give title to real property situate outside of Canada. The negotiating churches hold valuable property situate in colonies of Great Britain and in foreign countries which is held in diverse ways and in many cases under some form of trust for the churches of Canada. Section 15 provides that the United Church shall have the right to call for and receive conveyances of such property but it will be necessary to procure legislation in a number of such colonies and countries to give effect to the union, although it will no doubt be practicable to hold considerable of the property in foreign countries for the United Church in the same manner in which it has been hitherto held for the negotiating churches. We think it advisable that such legislation as may be required abroad should be prepared by local counsel familiar with the needs of the situation but that they should, as far as possible, make such legislation uniform with the provisions of the Dominion Bill.

9. BOARDS AND COMMITTEES.

The negotiating churches have many separate boards and committees which have been created from time to time for the management of their funds and schemes. It will be incumbent upon the United Church to formulate plans and agencies for the administration of all these different activities, which will call for the establishment of many similar boards and committees with appropriate powers for their respective purposes. Section 16 (a) empowers the General Council to establish all such boards or committees and to delegate such powers to them as it may deem expedient.

It has been found advisable in all the churches that many of these boards and committees should be incorporated. The Presbyterian Church and the Congregational Churches have obtained legislation incorporating a number of such boards and committees, and although it was itself a body corporate, the Methodist Church found it necessary in 1912 to secure amendments to its Act of Incorporation enabling its Conferences to create bodies corporate. As the United Church will be incorporated it does not seem desirable that it should be compelled to seek further legislation to incorporate such subsidiary bodies. By section 16 (b) power is conferred on the United Church to establish boards and committees as bodies corporate either by the General Council or by the Conferences if so empowered for that purpose by the General Council.

10. APPROVAL OF CONFERENCES.

In defining the powers of the General Council the Basis of Union states that it shall have power "to legislate on all matters respecting property, subject to the limitations elsewhere provided in this Basis of Union, and subject also to the approval of the Conference in which the property is situated." (Clause 24, 2 (b), page 23.)

There will be a large amount of general church property which will be controlled by the General Council and we presume it was not intended that the General Council should obtain approval of its dealings with the general property of the whole church by each Conference in which such property might be situate. We fear that this would be impracticable and we have, therefore, endeavoured to make the position clear by section 18 which declares that this provision in the Basis of Union shall apply only to congregational property and to property used for the purposes of a particular conference. The Model Trust Deed provides that the consent of the Presbytery must be obtained to a sale or mortgage by trustees of congregational property but that an appeal may be taken from the decision of the Presbytery to the Conference. This is in accordance with clause 6, under the heading "Polity," in the Basis of Union.

11. DEBENTURES.

We are informed that congregations have sometimes raised funds for building purposes by the issue of debentures and that this procedure has been found useful. Cases may arise in which the United Church or its boards or committees may find it an advantage to secure money in this manner, and section 19 has been prepared to give the necessary power for that purpose. When congregations propose to issue debentures the consent of the Presbytery must first be obtained.

12. FIRST MEETING OF GENERAL COUNCIL.

We have been compelled to make special provision with respect to the first meeting of the General Council, which will be found in section 20. The Basis of Union provides that it "shall consist of an equal number of ministers and non-ministerial representatives chosen by the Conference", but does not fix the number of such representatives. While the representatives are to be chosen by the Conferences, the Basis of Union provides that the number and boundaries of Conferences are to be determined by the General Council. Special legislation for the first meeting of the General Council would, therefore, seem to be indispensable.

The duties of the first General Council will be onerous and exacting, and its sessions will probably be protracted, inasmuch as it must provide for the taking over and administration by the United Church of all the many and diversified funds and schemes of the negotiating churches and for the general organization of its affairs. It is important that this work should proceed as quickly as possible after the passing of the Act of Incorporation and we believed that, owing to their special character, the duties of the Council at its first meeting can be more expeditiously and efficiently discharged by a comparatively small body of delegates. We, therefore, recommended that the General Council at this first meeting should consist of certain members to be appointed by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, the General Conference of the Methodist Church and the Congregational Union of Canada. This was approved by the Union Committee which fixed the number of members to be so appointed, and provided for representation of the local union churches.

As the first meeting is not provided for in the Basis of Union, it was deemed advisable that the acts of the Council at such first meeting should be subject to review by the first Council regularly convened under the Basis of Union. The section, therefore, provides that the acts of the General Council at such first meeting shall be valid and binding until the General Council is duly convened and thereafter until the same shall be altered, amended or rescinded by the General Council.

It will doubtless be convenient for the Council at this first meeting to appoint committees to investigate and report upon the questions to be considered. Sub-section (e) precludes any doubt as to the powers of the Council to appoint such committees.

The Basis of Union provides that the General Council shall meet every second year. It will probably be necessary to convene a General Council within two years from the date of the first meeting. Sub-section (d) provides for this and supplements the provisions of the Basis of Union as to the composition of the General Council.

12. INTERIM EXERCISE OF POWERS.

During the interval between the passing of the Act and the first meeting of the General Council business will undoubtedly arise which cannot be laid over until the General Council is able to deal with it. It seems to us that during this period all former organizations should continue to exercise their functions. Section 21 was drawn for this purpose. A portion of this section as first printed became unnecessary by reason of the provisions of other sections and has been omitted in the reprint.

13. THE BASIS OF UNION RATIFIED.

In section 24 the Basis of Union is expressly ratified and confirmed so as to make it of the same force and effect as if it were set out in the Bill.

14. BENEVOLENT FUNDS.

No special provision has been made in the bills in regard to the funds relating to aged or infirm ministers or widows or orphans of ministers, as this subject is dealt with fully in the Basis of Union.

15. COMMENCEMENT OF ACT.

The bills have been drafted on the supposition that the Provincial Bills may be considered by the Provincial Legislatures before the Act of Incorporation is passed by the Parliament of Canada. It may be that the language in the Provincial Bills will require some change depending upon whether a Bill in a Province is passed by the Legislature of that Province before or after the passing of the Act of Incorporation. The Dominion Bill provides that it shall come into force upon its receiving the Royal Assent, except as to the sections dealing with property, which are to come into force on a day to be fixed later. The Provincial Bills contain similar provisions. It is desirable that all property should vest under the legislation of the Dominion and of all the provinces as of the same date and it is therefore, suggested that the date at which the property sections shall come into force shall be the same in all the legislation.

16. SPECIAL PROVISION IN REGARD TO NON-CONCURRING CONGREGATIONS.

In the Appendix on Law to the Basis of Union a note appears that at a meeting of the Presbyterian Union Committee held on December 15, 1914, it was resolved that "it is expected that in the proposed legislation proper provision will be made to guard the rights or privileges of any minority which may be opposed to union." In accordance with this resolution we submitted two sections to provide for congregations withdrawing from the union. These were considered by the Union Committee and by its direction, now appear as amended by the Committee, as sections 9 and 10 of the Bill.

Section 9 provides that congregations may within six months after the passing of the Act withdraw from the Union by a majority of votes of the members and that in that event the property of such congregations shall not be affected by the Bill. This section is based upon a similar provision in the Acts providing for the union of the Presbyterian Churches in 1875, but gives, in addition, the right of possible participation in the general property and rights of the parent church as set out in section 10.

Provision is also made for the subsequent entry of such congregations into the union, based on the legislation of 1875, but as that legislation did not give the dissenting churches any right of participation in the general property of the parent church, it seemed to us that it might be advisable that some limitation should be placed on the right of non-concurring congregations to enter into the union and it was pointed out that on such entry a non-concurring congregation might not be able to bring to the United Church that portion of the general property which had been withdrawn from the United Church by reason of its non-concurrence. The Committee, however, after consideration, approved of the section in this respect without any limitations.

Section 10 provides for the establishment of a commission with full power to allocate to non-concurring congregations such portion of the property and rights of the parent church as it may deem fair and equitable. The first printed draft of this section provided that the non-concurrence should assume some minimum proportion before the Commission should be established but this portion of the section was not approved by the Union Committee and the section as now drafted carries out its instructions.

We have provided that there shall be only one Commission to deal with the non-concurring congregations of all the negotiating churches and we have made provision for the appointment of such a Commission in the event of refusal or failure on the part of those entitled, to make the original appointment. We have endeavoured to provide a Commission with such comprehensive powers that it can do ample justice to all the interests concerned and are of opinion that by virtue of these sections fair and equitable provision can be made for all non-concurring congregations.

Subsection (i) of section 10 provides that the Committee may sit in sections for certain purposes. This will effect a saving of time and money.

Subsections 10 (i), 10 (j) and 10 (h) in part were not included in the draft bill submitted to the Union Committee. The principle of the Commission sections having been approved by the Union Committee, these subsections have been added to make better provision for the efficient working of the Commission.

The Provincial Bills contain a section substantially the same as section 9 of the Dominion Bill in respect of the property of non-concurring congregations and also a provision whereby the powers of the Commission may be exercised in reference to property and civil rights within the Provinces.

17. PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION.

The Provincial Legislation, which, with the exception of the definitions already mentioned and sections 20, 21 and 22, will be uniform in all the provinces, is largely confirmatory of the Dominion legislation and calls for little additional comment. These exceptions are applicable only to certain provinces indicated in the draft and it will be useful if members of the various bodies by which the legislation will be considered will examine the legislation specially designed for their respective provinces in order to determine whether it satisfies all local requirements.

18 INCORPORATED CONGREGATIONS AND BOARDS OF TRUSTEES.

We should, however, direct attention particularly to section 20, applicable to New Brunswick. It has been previously mentioned that there are many congregations, particularly in the Maritime Provinces, which have been separately incorporated either under special Acts or in compliance with the provisions of general Acts. We are not familiar with the local conditions which have made it desirable to have such separate incorporation. We cannot see that such incorporation will be of any advantage when these congregations become a part of the United Church. We should also point out that, in the Maritime Provinces particularly, many boards of trustees, as distinct from congregations, are bodies corporate under Provincial legislation. These are questions in considering which it will be useful to have the views of members of the various church bodies residing in these Provinces. It seems to us that it is not important whether or not such boards are incorporated as long as they hold upon the trusts of the Model Deed but it may be desirable for the sake of uniformity in the various provinces to arrive at some understanding upon the subject. Section 18 is submitted as a basis for consideration and not as a recommendation on our part. While the passing of this section in New Brunswick might not effect any considerable change, the extension thereof to Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Quebec would mean that large numbers of boards of trustees not now incorporated would thereby become corporate bodies, which may not be desirable.

The provisions of section 20 applicable to Ontario and the Western Provinces are designed to simplify dealing with property and we shall appreciate suggestions for their improvement in order that the legislation may be adapted to the legislation of the various Provinces.

Yours faithfully,
GERSHOM W. MASON.
McGREGOR YOUNG.

(*c*) PROPOSED DOMINION LEGISLATION.

AN ACT INCORPORATING THE UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA.

Whereas the Petitioners hereinafter named have represented that The Presbyterian Church in Canada, The Methodist Church, and The Congregational Churches of Canada have agreed to unite and form one body or denomination of Christians under the name of "The United Church of Canada," in accordance with the terms and provisions of the Basis of Union set forth in Schedule "A" to this Act, and have prayed that it may be enacted as hereinafter set forth;

And Whereas it is expedient to grant the prayer of the said petition;

Therefore His Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada enacts as follows:

1. This Act may be cited as "The United Church of Canada Act." **Short Title.**

2. In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, the expression— **Definitions.**

(*a*) "The negotiating churches" means the churches mentioned in the preamble, and shall include also every congregation heretofore in connection or in communion with any of the negotiating churches which prior to the coming into force of this Act has joined with any one or more congregation or congregations of any of the other negotiating churches for purposes of worship, and every congregation affiliated with any of the negotiating churches, and every congregation ordinarily known as a local union church whether it holds its property separately from or as a part of any of the negotiating churches, and every congregation having any representation in or connection with the General Council of local union churches. **"The Negotiating Churches."**

(*b*) "The Basis of Union" means the Basis of Union set forth in Schedule "A" to this Act. **"The Basis of Union."**

(*c*) "Congregation" means any local church, charge, circuit, congregation or other local unit for purposes of worship in con- **"Congregation."**

nection or in communion with any of the negotiating churches or of The United Church of Canada.

"College." (*d*) "College" means any college, school or other educational institution, incorporated or unincorporated, under the government or control of, or in connection with, any of the negotiating churches, or established or maintained in whole or in part by any of them, and shall include the colleges and institutions set out in Schedule "C" to this Act.

"The Presbyterian Church in Canada." (*e*) "The Presbyterian Church in Canada" shall include The Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax; The Board of Trustees of the Presbyterian Church in Canada; The Board of Trustees of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, Eastern Section; The Board of Trustees of the Century Church and Manse Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, Eastern Section; The Church and Manse Board of the Presbyterian Church in Canada; The Board of Trustees of the Presbytery of Montreal; The Board for the management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada; The Managers of the Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, and all Presbyterian congregations separately incorporated under any Statute of the Dominion of Canada or of any Province thereof, and all congregations heretofore and now connected or in communion with the Presbyterian Church in Canada whether the same shall have been organized under the provisions of any Statute or Deed of Trust or as union or as joint stock churches or otherwise howsoever.

(To be amended to include names of any additional corporations submitted by the Presbyterian Committee on Church Union.)

"The Methodist Church." (*f*) "The Methodist Church" shall include the body corporate known as The Methodist Church and all bodies corporate established or created by the Methodist Church or any conference thereof under the provisions of any Statute of the Parliament of Canada or the Legislature of any Province thereof, the Methodist Union of Toronto, and all Methodist congregations separately incorporated under any Statute of any Province of the Dominion of Canada.

(To be amended to include names of any additional corporations submitted by the Methodist Committee on Church Union.)

"Congregational Churches." (*g*) "Congregational Churches" shall include The Congregational Union of Canada; The Congregational Union of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; The Canada Congregational Missionary Society; The Canada Congregational Foreign Missionary Society; The Montreal Congregational Church Building Fund Society; The Congregational Provident Fund Society; Congregational Church Extension Society of Western Canada; and all congregations of the Congregational denomination separately incorporated under any Statute of the Dominion of Canada or of any Province thereof, and all congregations thereof whether the same shall have been organized under the provisions of any Statute or Deed of Trust or as union or as joint stock churches or otherwise howsoever.

(To be amended to include names of any additional corporations submitted by the Congregational Committee on Church Union.)

3. The petitioners, The Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, The General Superintendent of the Methodist Church, and The Chairman of the Congregational Union of Canada, and The Chairman of the General Council of local Union Churches together with all persons who now are ministers or members of any congregation of any of the negotiating churches, not withdrawing from the union, and such other persons as may hereafter from time to time become ministers or members of The United Church of Canada, are hereby constituted a body corporate and politic under the name of "The United Church of Canada" hereinafter called the "United Church," and the negotiating churches are hereby united and merged in the United Church.

Incorporation.

Name.

4. Save as hereinafter provided all property, real and personal belonging to or held in trust for or to the use of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, the Methodist Church and the Congregational Churches, or belonging to or held in trust for or to the use of any Corporation, Board, Committee or other body, whether incorporated or unincorporated, created by or under the government or control of, or in connection with, any of the said churches, shall henceforth be vested in the United Church, to be held, used and administered, subject to the provisions of this Act, in accordance with the terms and provisions of the Basis of Union.

General Property Vested in the United Church.

5. Subject to the provisions of section seven hereof, all property, real and personal, belonging to or held by or in trust for or to the use of any congregation of any of the negotiating churches, shall henceforth be held, used and administered for the benefit of the same congregation as a part of the United Church in the manner and upon the trusts and subject to the terms and provisions set forth in Schedule "B" to this Act, and all property, real and personal, hereafter acquired for or belonging to or held by or in trust for or to the use of any congregation of the United Church shall be held, used and administered for the benefit of the said congregation as a part of the United Church upon the said trusts and subject to the said terms and provisions. Provided that any property, real or personal, now held or hereafter acquired by devise, bequest, transfer or gift, in trust for any special use of any congregation, shall be held, used and administered in accordance with the special trusts so declared in respect thereof, not being contrary to law or to any by-law, rule or regulation of the United Church, and that in the event of failure or partial failure of any of the said trusts, the said property may be held, used, administered or disposed of as may be provided by any by-law, rule or regulation made from time to time by the United Church, but subject always to such laws of any Province of Canada as may be applicable thereto.

Congregational Property.

6. In any deed, conveyance or transfer to trustees upon the trusts set forth in said Schedule "B" the form of words contained in Column 1 of said Schedule "B" and distinguished by any number therein, shall have the same effect as if it contained the form of words in Column 2 of said Schedule "B", distinguished by the same number as is annexed to the form of words used in such deed, conveyance or transfer, but it shall not be necessary in any such deed, conveyance or transfer to insert any such number.

Short form of Trust Deed.

Special Property of Certain Congregations.

7. The rights of the several congregations named in Schedule "D" to this Act in regard to their respective properties therein set out, or, with the approval of the Presbytery within whose bounds such property is situate, of any congregation hereafter received into the United Church in regard to any real or personal property belonging to or held by or in trust for or to the use of such congregation, solely for its own benefit, shall not be subject to the provisions of sections four and five hereof, or to the control of the United Church, unless and until any such congregation at a meeting thereof duly called for the purpose shall consent that such provisions shall apply to any such property or a specified part thereof.

Existing Trustees Continued.

8. All the trustees acting in any of the trusts referred to in section five hereof shall, notwithstanding any irregularity in their appointment, and notwithstanding that their number shall not correspond with the number named in the deed of conveyance of the property subject to such trusts or any of them, be deemed to be and shall be the trustees of the said properties respectively, and shall henceforth hold the same upon and subject to the trusts set out in Schedule "B" hereto.

Property of Non-concurring Congregations not affected.

9. Provided always that if any congregation in connection or communion with any of the negotiating churches shall, at a meeting of the congregation regularly called and held within six months after the passing of this Act, decide by a majority of votes of the persons in full membership, whose names are on the roll of the church present at such meeting, not to concur in the said union of the said churches, but to withdraw therefrom, then and in such case the property, real and personal, belonging to or held in trust for, or to the use of, such congregation shall remain unaffected by this Act, and the congregation shall also be entitled as one of the non-concurring congregations therein named, but subject to the provisions thereof, to the benefit of the provisions contained in the next succeeding section of this Act. Should such congregation so decide at any later time to enter into the union and become part of the United Church then this Act shall apply to the congregation and all the property thereof from the date of such decision.

Commission to determine Equities of Non-concurring Congregations

10. (*a*) Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained such congregations so voting as aforesaid (in this section hereafter called the non-concurring congregations), or any one or more of them as may be determined, shall be entitled to whatever, if anything, the Commission hereinafter mentioned shall determine to be a fair and equitable share of the property, real and personal, rights, powers, authorities and privileges of or in connection with the respective parent church or churches, that is to say, the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Methodist Church or the Congregational Churches as the case may be, vested in the United Church by this Act.

Appointment of Commission.

(*b*) All the equities (if any) of the non-concurring congregations or any of them, under this section, shall be determined exclusively by a Commission to consist of nine members, of whom three shall be appointed by the non-concurring congregations, three by the United Church from its members, and the remaining three by the six members so appointed. In case the six members are unable to agree or in case of failure or refusal on the part of the non-concurring congregations or of the United Church to appoint the required number of members as aforesaid within nine months after the passing of this Act, the Chief Jus-

Vacancies.

tice of Canada upon the application of any interested party shall appoint sufficient members to complete the Commission of nine members, and any appointment so made by him to fill any vacancy among the members of the Commission, or any order of the Chief Justice on the application of any interested party confirming the appointment of the Commission, shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review by any Court. If a vacancy occurs in the Commission by reason of death, resignation, incapacity or otherwise it shall be filled by a member to be appointed as in the case of the original appointment of the member whose office is so vacated and in case of inability to agree or of failure or refusal to appoint as aforesaid, as the case may be, the Chief Justice of Canada may appoint a member to fill the vacancy and so from time to time as occasion requires.

Power to determine Equities and make Orders and Directions.

(*c*) The Commission shall have exclusive power to determine all the equities of the non-concurring congregations, or any one or more of them, in, or with respect to, the property, real and personal, belonging to or held in trust for or to the use of the respective parent church or any corporation, board, committee or other body, incorporated or unincorporated, created by or under the government or control of or in connection with such parent church, and all rights, powers, authorities and privileges of or in connection with the parent church, vested by this Act in the United Church as aforesaid, or in or to any part of such property, rights, powers, authorities and privileges, and to make such orders and give such directions for the conveyance, assignment, transfer or other assurance by the United Church, or by any corporation, board, committee or other body in this Act mentioned, of any such property, rights, powers, authorities, and privileges to the non-concurring congregations or to any one or more of them or to trustees for any such congregations or any one or more of them, in such manner and upon such terms and subject to such charges or conditions as the Commission may deem fair and equitable for the enjoyment and assurance of any such equities so determined.

Power in Respect to Colleges.

(*d*) The Commission shall also have power to make such orders and to give such directions with respect to any of the colleges of or in connection with the parent church in Schedule "C" of this Act named as it may deem fair and equitable to secure adequate provision for the education and training of students to minister to such non-concurring congregations, and shall have power to declare and order that such non-concurring congregations shall be placed in the position of the parent church as it was immediately prior to the passing of this Act with respect to any one or more of such colleges as the Commission may determine subject to such terms and conditions as the Commission may deem fair and equitable.

Quorum and Procedure.

(*e*) The quorum of the Commission shall be five and its organization, times and places of meeting and procedure shall be such as it may at any time from time to time determine and the decision of a majority of the members present at any meeting shall prevail.

Assistance.

(*f*) The Commission may retain counsel and engage all such professional or other assistance and may appoint and employ all such officers, stenographers, clerks or servants as it may deem expedient and may dismiss any officer or person so appointed or employed.

Remuneration

(*g*) The fees, salaries and remuneration of all persons so retained, engaged, appointed or employed, and all expenses in connection with the exercise of the powers hereby conferred shall be paid in such manner and out of such funds of the United Church or the non-concurring congregations or both, as the Commission may direct. The compensation (if any) of the Commissioners shall be determined by the General Council of the United Church and the non-concurring congregations prior to their appointment, and in default of such determination, by the Chief Justice of Canada, and shall be paid as aforesaid.

Witnesses and Evidence.

(*h*) The Commission shall have the powers conferred on commissioners by part 1 of the Inquiries Act and such other powers as may be conferred upon it by any Act of any Province of Canada, together with right of access to all property affected by this Act it may find necessary to inspect and the right to call for the production of any books, papers, accounts, correspondence or other writing of any of the parties interested before it and to make abstracts thereof or take extracts therefrom. The Commission shall not be bound by legal rules of evidence but may make such enquiries and may accept such opinions, valuations, reports and statements, written or verbal, as it may deem expedient, and the decisions, orders or directions of the Commission shall be final and conclusive and not subject to review by any Court.

Delegation of Certain Powers.

(*i*) The Commission may authorize any one or more of its members to inquire into and report to it upon any question or matter arising in connection with the business of the Commission, and when so authorized, such one or more of its members shall have all the powers of the Commission for the purpose of taking evidence or acquiring the necessary information for the purpose of such report, and upon such report being made to the Commission, it may be adopted as the order of the Commission, or otherwise dealt with as to the Commission seems proper.

Commission to use Due Diligence.

(*j*) The Commission shall proceed with all due diligence in the determination of all matters committed to it by this Act and the United Church and the non-concurring congregations shall in every reasonable way facilitate and expedite the work of the Commission so as to enable it to make its investigation and its determination in respect of the matters aforesaid at the earliest possible date.

Enforcement of Orders.

(*k*) The orders of the Commission may be enforced in the same manner as a judgment of any Superior Court of Canada.

Applications to Chief Justice or Judge of Supreme Court.

(*l*) The powers conferred on the Chief Justice of Canada by this section may be exercised by any Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada designated by him for that purpose and all applications to the said Chief Justice or such Judge in this section mentioned shall be upon such notice and be served upon such parties and in such manner as the Chief Justice or such Judge shall direct.

(*m*) "Congregation" in this section and the next preceding section means a local church as mentioned in the Basis of Union.

Liability for Debts.

11. (*a*) All property belonging to or held by or in trust for or to the use of any congregation of the negotiating churches henceforth to be held, used and administered for the benefit of the same congregation as a part of the United Church, shall remain liable for the payment or satisfaction of any debts or obligations contracted or incurred in respect thereto to the same extent as it would have been liable had this Act not been passed but the United Church shall not be or become liable for any of

said debts or obligations and, save as aforesaid, no property of the United Church shall be liable for any debts or obligations contracted or incurred by any congregation in connection or in communion with any of the negotiating churches.

(*b*) The United Church, upon receiving, taking or acquiring any property of any of the negotiating churches or of any Corporation, Board, Committee or other body, whether incorporated or unincorporated, created by or under the government or control of or in connection with any of the negotiating churches, vested by this Act in the United Church, shall, except as hereinafter provided, become liable for all debts and obligations contracted or incurred by any of the negotiating churches or by any such Corporation, Board, Committee or other body, provided, however, that this section shall not be deemed to include or apply to any of the property first mentioned in the next preceding sub-section.

Colleges.

12. The provisions of section four hereof shall not apply to any property, real or personal, belonging to or held in trust for or to the use of any college named in Schedule "C" to this Act, or belonging to or held by or vested in any board of trustees, board of directors, board of governors, regents, or other board or committee or body having the control or management of the property or affairs of any college named in said Schedule "C". From and after the passing of this Act the colleges named in said Schedule "C" and all such boards, regents or other committees or bodies as aforesaid shall have the same connection with and stand in the same relation to the United Church as they respectively had and stood with and to any of the negotiating churches immediately prior to the passing of this Act, and all rights, powers, authorities and privileges in respect of the said colleges, or any of them, of or vested in any Assembly, Conference, Synod, Presbytery, Council or other governing body of any of the negotiating churches or any officers or board thereof, shall be vested in the General Council of the United Church provided that the General Council may declare that the said rights, powers, authorities and privileges, or any of them, shall be vested in Conference, Presbytery or other governing body of the United Church, or otherwise, as it may deem expedient, and from and after such declaration such rights, powers, authorities and privileges, or any of them, shall vest in accordance with the terms of such declaration. In all cases where a college corporation consists of the ministers and members, or the members, or any officers of any of the negotiating churches, or of any governing body thereof (whether with or without named persons) such corporation shall hereafter consist of the ministers and members of the United Church. All rights, powers, authorities and privileges in respect of the said colleges vested in any congregation in connection or in communion with any of the negotiating churches, or in any minister and congregation thereof, shall continue to be held and exercised by the said congregation or by the said minister and congregation in connection with the United Church. Nothing in this section contained shall be construed so as in anywise to repeal, alter, affect or vary any existing legislation relating to any of the said colleges except in so far as may be necessary to give full force and effect to the provisions of this Act.

Religious Teaching in Colleges.

13. Notwithstanding anything contained in any Act of the Parliament of Canada, or in any Act, by-law, rule, regulation, declaration or other proceeding of any of the negotiating

churches, or of any governing or subordinate court or body of any of them, or in the constitution, by-laws, rules or regulations of or in relation to any of the said colleges, respecting the principles, doctrines or religious standards to be taught and maintained in any such college, the principles, doctrines and religious standards to be taught and maintained in the said colleges from and after the passing of this Act shall be the principles, doctrines and religious standards set out in the Basis of Union or determined or prescribed from time to time by the General Council of the United Church in accordance therewith or with this Act, and the teaching or maintenance herafter in any of said colleges of the said principles, doctrines and religious standards so set out or so hereafter determined or prescribed shall not be deemed to be a change of adherence on the part of any such college or a change of its principles or doctrines or religious standards or a breach of the provisions of any statute, Act, by-law, rule, regulation, declaration or other proceeding, or constitution, and shall not be deemed to be a breach of any trust relating to property devised, bequeathed, given to or otherwise acquired by or for the benefit of any such college with respect to the teaching or maintenance of any principles, doctrines or religious standards in any of the said colleges, but shall be deemed to be in compliance with and a performance of any such provisions or trusts.

Existing Trusts Continued.

14. Where prior to the passing of this Act any existing trust has been created or declared in any manner whatsoever for any special purpose or object having regard to the teaching, preaching or maintenance of any principles, doctrines or religious standards, or to the support, assistance or maintenance of any congregation or minister or charity, or to the furtherance of any religious, charitable, educational, congregational or social purpose, in connection with any of the negotiating churches, such trust shall continue to exist and to be performed as nearly as may be for the like purposes or objects in connection with the United Church as the United Church may determine, and anything done in pursuance of this Act shall not be deemed to be a breach of any such trust but shall be deemed to be in compliance therewith and a performance thereof and the entry of any congregation into the United Church shall not be deemed a change of its adherence or principles or doctrines or religious standards within the meaning of any such trust.

Property Situate Without Canada.

15. The United Church shall have capacity to take and hold all such property, real and personal, and all such rights, authorities, privileges and benefits as it may acquire without Canada, and subject to the laws of the province, colony or country in which such property may be situate, shall have the right to call for and receive conveyances, transfers or other appropriate assurances of all property, real or personal, situate without Canada, held by or in trust for any of the negotiating churches or any governing or subordinate body thereof, or any Corporation, Board, Committee, or other body, whether incorporated or unincorporated, created by or under the government or control of or in connection with any of the negotiating churches.

Establishment of Boards and Committees.

16. (*a*) The United Church may by resolution of the General Council establish boards or committees of its members to hold, manage, deal with, dispose of or otherwise administer any of its property, funds, trusts, interests, institutions and religious or charitable schemes now, or hereafter owned, founded or es-

tablished, define and prescribe the constitution, powers, duties, officers and quorum of any such board or committee, and may delegate to any of them such powers as it may deem expedient.

Establishment of Boards and Committees as Bodies Corporate.

(*b*) Whenever it is deemed expedient to establish as a body corporate any board, committee or other body for any of the purposes of the United Church, the United Church may establish by resolution of the General Council, or may authorise and empower any Conference to establish by resolution of such Conference, any such boards, committees or other bodies, including city mission boards and church extension boards,in accordance with the by-laws, rules and regulations of the United Church in that behalf, and if any such resolution declares such board, committee or other body to be a body corporate then, upon the filing of the certificate or certificates in this section hereinafter mentioned the same shall be and become a body corporate with such membership, organization, powers, rights and duties not contrary to law nor inconsistent with this Act as may be defined from time to time by the General Council, or such Conference, as the case may be, including the acquiring, holding, administering and disposing of all property, real or personal, which may be devised, bequeathed, granted or conveyed to any such board, committee or governing body, for the purposes of the United Church, (but when established by resolution of a Conference then only within the bounds of such Conference) and the borrowing of any money necessary in the opinion of such board, committee or body for the purposes thereof, and the mortgaging, hypothecating or pledging of so much of the real or personal property held by any such board, committee or body as may be necessary to secure any amount so borrowed. In case such board, committee or other body is established by resolution of the General Council, the General Council shall file a certified copy of such resolution under the hand of its presiding officer and its secretary or clerk with the Secretary of State for Canada, and in case such board, committee or other body is established by resolution of any Conference, such Conference shall file a certified copy of such resolution under the hand of its presiding officer and its secretary or clerk with the Provincial Secretary of the Province in which the said conference is situate, or where the bounds of such conference lie within more than one Province then with the Provincial Secretary of each of such Provinces. A certificate under the official seal of the General Council, or of the Conference by which any such board, committee or body is established, as the case may be, signed by its secretary or clerk shall be sufficient evidence in all Courts of the establishment of such board, committee or body and of its constitution and powers.

Powers of the United Church.

17. The United Church shall have power—

Acquiring and Selling Property.

(*a*) To acquire by purchase, lease, gift, devise or bequest any real or personal property, or any estate or interest therein, either absolutely or in trust, and, subject to the provisions of sections five and seven of this Act, to sell, transfer, exchange, mortgage, hypothecate, lease or otherwise dispose of the same or any part thereof, and apply the proceeds of any such property for its purposes, provided that no land at any time acquired by the United Church and not required for its actual use and occupation or by way of security for the payment of any loan, debt, or guarantee, shall be held by it or by any trustee on its behalf for a longer period than ten years after it shall have ceased to be so required, but this proviso shall not be deemed in anywise to vary or otherwise affect any trust relating to such property.

Disposal of Property to Other Religious Bodies.

(*b*) To give, grant, convey, lease or otherwise alienate any property, real or personal, to any other church or religious body or organization or to any trustees, board, committee or governing body thereof, as it may deem expedient, in pursuance of any agreement or understanding with such church or religious body or organization for the purpose of co-operation in the prosecution of religious work.

Loan and Investment.

(*c*) To lend money upon the security of real estate and to invest and re-invest any of its funds and moneys in any debentures of municipal or public school corporations or public school districts, Dominion or Provincial debentures, bonds, stock or other Dominion or Provincial securities, or in any security the payment of which is guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada or any Province thereof, and for all purposes of any loan or investment it shall have all such rights and remedies for the collection, enforcement or repayment thereof as any individual or corporation would have by law in the premises.

Loan or Disposal of Property for Building Purposes.

(*d*) To lend or give any of its property, funds or moneys for, or to assist in, the erection or maintenance of any buildings deemed necessary for any church, college, manse, school or hospital, or for any other religious, charitable, educational, congregational or social purpose, upon such terms and securities as it may deem expedient, and it shall have in respect of any such loan the rights and remedies mentioned in the next preceding subsection.

Borrowing.

(*e*) To borrow money for its purposes upon its credit and to mortgage, hypothecate or pledge any of its property, real or personal, as security for any loan.

Negotiable Instruments.

(*f*) To make, accept, draw, endorse and execute bills of exchange, promissory notes and other negotiable instruments.

(*g*) To receive and accept for its own use as to the principal sum or corpus thereof any moneys or other personal property subject to and in consideration of the payment of interest thereon or of an annuity in respect thereof.

By-Laws Rules and Regulations.

(*h*) To make such by-laws, rules or regulations as it may deem expedient for the exercise of any powers conferred by this Act.

Appointment of Subordinate Bodies.

(*i*) To exercise the powers conferred by this section or any of them by and through such boards, committees or other bodies as the General Council or any Conference or any Presbytery acting within their respective jurisdictions under the provisions of the Basis of Union may from time to time establish or appoint, and to determine the method of appointment or election thereof, and to define and prescribe the constitution, powers, duties, officers and quorum of such boards, committees or other bodies.

Incidental Powers.

(*j*) To do all such lawful acts or things as may be requisite to carry out the terms, provisions and objects of the Basis of Union and of this Act.

Approval of Conference Required in Certain Cases.

18. The provision in the Basis of Union that the approval of the Conference in which property is situate is required to enable the General Council to legislate in respect thereof shall be deemed to apply only to such property as belongs to or is held in trust for or to the use of a congregation or as belongs to or is held in trust for or is set apart for or used for the purposes of such Conference.

Issue of Debentures.

19. The United Church, and any board or committee thereof or appointed thereby or by any Conference thereof, having charge of any of the funds or property of the United Church, and the trustees of any congregation of the United Church, provided that such trustees first obtain the consent in writing of the Presbytery within the bounds of which the lands of such congregation are situate, may issue debentures in such denominations and upon such terms as it or they may deem expedient under the hand or hands of such officer or officers as may be thereto authorized and the seal (if any) of such United Church, board, committee or trustees issuing the same, for any money borrowed under the authority of this Act, and the payment of such debentures and the interest thereon may be secured by mortgage in favor of a trustee or trustees for the holders of such debentures upon any real estate under the control of the United Church or of such board or committee thereof or of the trustees of such congregation.

First Meeting of the General Council.

20. (*a*) Notwithstanding anything in this Act or in the Basis of Union contained, the first meeting of the General Council shall consist of 150 members heretofore appointed by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, 150 members heretofore appointed by the General Conference of the Methodist Church, 40 members heretofore appointed by the Congregational Union of Canada and 10 members heretofore appointed by the General Council of local Union churches and the roll of members so appointed signed by the presiding officer and the secretary or clerk of such respective bodies holding office at the date of the passing of this Act, shall be final and conclusive as to the due and proper appointment of such members.

(*b*) The said meeting shall be held in the City of Toronto on the sixth Wednesday after the date of the passing of this Act at such place and at such hour as may be agreed upon by the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the General Superintendent of the Methodist Church and the Chairman of the Congregational Union of Canada, or any two of them.

(*c*) The said General Council at such meeting, or any adjourned meeting thereof, shall exercise all such powers conferred on the General Council by this Act or by the Basis of Union as it may deem expedient for the conduct and management of the affairs of the United Church until a General Council is convened in accordance with the provisions of the Basis of Union.

(*d*) The said General Council at such first meeting or any adjournment thereof, shall determine the number and boundaries of the Conferences to be established under the provisions of the Basis of Union and the number of ministers and non-ministerial reepresentatives to be chosen by the said Conferences to constitute the next General Council, which may be convened at any time within a period of two years from the date of such first meeting of the General Council.

(*e*) All acts or things done by or under the authority of the General Council at such meeting, or any adjournment thereof, not being inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or the Basis of Union, shall be valid and binding until a General Council is convened in accordance with the provisions of the Basis of Union and thereafter until the same shall be altered, amended or rescinded by a General Council so convened.

(*f*) The General Council at its first meeting as aforesaid, or any adjourned meeting thereof, may, in addition to its other powers, appoint such boards, committees or other bodies, as it may deem expedient, to inquire into any matters relating to the conduct and management of the affairs of the United Church or of any property, fund, trust, interest, institution or religious or charitable scheme in connection therewith or with any of the negotiating churches and to report upon the same to a General Council convened in accordance with the provisions of the Basis of Union.

Interim Exercise of Powers.

21. Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained, every Corporation, Board, Committee and other body, whether incorporated or unincorporated, created by or under the government or control of or in connection with any of the negotiating churches or any congregation thereof, and every organization, board, committee or governing body of or in connection with any congregation of the negotiating churches and every officer or member of such congregation, shall continue to have, exercise and enjoy all their respective powers, rights, authorities and privileges in the same manner and to the same extent as if this Act had not been passed, until such time or times as the United Church by its General Council, or otherwise, shall declare that the said powers, rights, authorities and privileges, or any of them, shall cease or determine or be modified or altered as set out in such declaration and thereupon such powers, rights, authorities and privileges, or any of them, shall cease or determine or be modified or altered, as the case may be, in accordance with the terms of such declaration or declarations from time to time made.

Resolutions of General Council.

22. All resolutions passed by the General Council shall have the force and effect of by-laws, and no formal by-law shall be required for the purpose of managing the affairs of the United Church.

Copies of Certain Documents to be Evidence.

23. All copies of the Basis of Union and of any by-laws, resolutions, rules or regulations in this Act referred to or of any amendment or alteration thereof published under the direction or authority of the General Council of the United Church, and purporting to be so published, or a copy of any by-law, resolution, rule or regulation of the General Council under the seal of the United Church and signed by the secretary, shall be *prima facie* evidence in all Courts of the contents thereof.

Basis of Union Ratified and Confirmed.

24. The Basis of Union set forth in Schedule "A" to this Act is hereby ratified and confirmed and in so far as the terms and provisions thereof are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act they shall have the same force and effect as if expressly set out herein.

Repeal of Inconsistent Enactments.

25. All Acts and portions of Acts of the Parliament of Canada inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed in so far as may be necessary to give full effect to this Act.

Commencement of Act.

26. This Act shall come into force on the day upon which it receives the Royal Assent except as to sections four to nine inclusive which shall come into force on the day of , 19 .

Schedule "A"—The Basis of Union.
Schedule "B"—The Model Trust Deed.
Schedule "C"—The Colleges.
Schedule "D"—The Congregations, the property of which is not affected by sections four and five of the Act.

(*d*) MODEL TRUST DEED.

SCHEDULE B.

TRUSTS OF MODEL DEED.

And it is hereby declared that the said Trustees and their successors or the Trustee or Trustees for the time being acting in the trusts herein shall hold the said lands upon the following trusts:—

COLUMN TWO	*COLUMN ONE*
1. For the use and benefit of the said church, charge, circuit or congregation, as the case may be, (hereinafter called the congregation) as a part of the United Church of Canada, as well for the site of a church, chapel, meeting house, school, manse, parsonage or minister's dwelling or other place for religious, charitable, educational, congregational or social purposes, glebe or burial ground, as the said congregation may direct, as for the support and maintenance of public worship, and the propagation of Christian knowledge, according to the doctrine, discipline, by-laws, rules and regulations of the United Church of Canada.	1. Upon trust to use the trust property for purposes directed by congregation and maintenance of public worship.
2. And upon further trust, out of all moneys received by them for that purpose, to build, erect, add to, alter, repair, enlarge or rebuild any of the buildings aforesaid from time to time as they may deem expedient, and where they deem it necessary, to take down and remove any of said buildings for any of the purposes aforesaid.	2. To erect and repair buildings.
3. And upon further trust, that they shall and will obey, perform and fulfil and suffer to be obeyed, performed and fulfilled with respect to the said lands, and to any building or buildings at any time thereon, or to any burial ground, the lawful orders and directions respectively of the Official Board of the said congregation, the Presbytery and Conference respectively within whose bounds and under whose ecclesiastical jurisdiction the said congregation shall from time to time be, and of the General Council of the United Church of Canada.	3. To obey all lawful orders and directions.
4. And upon further trust, to permit, in conformity with the doctrines, discipline, bylaws, rules and regulations of the United Church of Canada and not otherwise, the following:—	4. To permit use of the trust property for church, manse and Sunday School purposes.
(*a*) The use of the said church, chapel or meeting house, as a place of religious worship by a congregation of the United Church of Canada and for meetings or services of religious or spiritual character or such benevolent	

or congregational purposes as may be approved by the session of such congregation, and the conduct of public worship and the various services and ordinances of religious worship therein by the minister of the said congregation or with the approval of the session or of the said minister by any other minister of the United Church of Canada or by any minister of any other religious denomination.

(*b*) The performance of burial services in any burial ground or cemetery belonging to or under the control of the congregation;

(*c*) The use of the manse, parsonage or minister's dwelling or dwellings with the appurtenances thereof by the minister or ministers of the congregation free from payment of any rent;

(*d*) The use of any church, chapel, meeting-house, school or other building for the purposes of a Sunday School at such hours and times as will not interfere with public worship, and

(*e*) The use of any buildings erected upon the said lands other than a church, chapel or meeting-house for such purposes as may from time to time be approved by the session of the congregation.

5. To let and sell pews and burial plots and to let manses.

5. And upon further trust, to let any pews and seats at a reasonable rent if so authorized by the official Board of the congregation whom they may appoint for that purpose with power to delegate any such letting to any person or persons; to let any buildings, not required for purposes of worship, at a reasonable rent; and if there shall be a burial ground or cemetery, to sell or let vaults, tombs or burial plots at a reasonable price or rent; and to account for and pay all moneys received in respect of any such letting or sale, less any expense incurred in the execution of these trusts, to the Treasurer of the congregation, or should there be no Treasurer, then to the Committee of Stewards of the congregation, or such person as shall be designated by the said Committee for the purpose of receiving the same. In case the Trustees are of the opinion that any manse, parsonage or minister's dwelling is not required for the use of the minister or ministers of the congregation, or is not desirable for the use of such minister or ministers, they may, with the consent in writing of said minister or ministers, let the same and use and apply the rent derived therefrom towards paying the board and lodging of such minister or ministers or the rent for a more suitable and convenient residence for such minister or ministers.

6. The Trustees or a majority of them may, but only with the consent in writing of the Presbytery within the bounds of which the lands are situate, (such consent to be under the hand of the presiding officer or secretary or clerk thereof) sell the said lands or any part thereof either by public sale or private contract and either for cash or upon credit and upon such terms as to price and for such price and upon such terms as to payment or otherwise as they may deem expedient; mortgage, hypothecate or exchange the said lands or any part thereof; let any church, chapel or meeting-house upon the same for such rent and upon such terms as they may deem expedient; and make all such conveyances, mortgages, leases and assurances as may be required to complete any such sale, mortgage, hypothecation, exchange or lease. The said Trustees after first paying or otherwise providing for all indebtedness of the Trustees shall apply the moneys arising from such sale, mortgage, hypothecation, lease or exchange for the purposes of such congregation as the Official Board thereof shall direct, for the needs or requirements of such congregation, but should such congregation cease to exist as an organized body, such proceeds, less any expense incurred in the execution of these trusts, shall be paid to the United Church of Canada to be applied for such purposes for the benefit of the United Church of Canada as the Conference within the bounds of which the said lands are situate may determine under the bylaws, rules and regulations of the General Council. Every application by Trustees for the consent of a Presbytery as aforesaid shall be in writing and shall state the purpose for which the moneys arising from such intended sale, mortgage, hypothecation, lease or exchange will be applied. Any decision of a Presbytery with regard to the sale, mortgage, hypothecation, lease or exchange of the said lands or any part thereof shall be subject to appeal to the Conference within the bounds of which the said lands are situate at the instance of not fewer than any five members of the congregation affected thereby. In every case where the consent of such Presbytery or Conference has been obtained as aforesaid it shall not be incumbent upon the purchaser, mortgagee or lessee of the said lands or of any part thereof to enquire into the necessity, expediency or propriety of any such sale, mortgage, hypothecation, lease or exchange, or to see to the application of the moneys paid to the Trustees. A certificate of the secretary or clerk of any Presbytery or Conference that any such consent has been given shall be sufficient and conclusive evidence of such consent.

6. The trustees shall have power to sell, mortgage, exchange or lease the trust property with the consent of the Presbytery.

7. The trustees shall keep proper accounts and minutes.

7. The said Trustees shall keep a proper book or books of account showing all moneys received and disbursed by them, and a book or books of minutes showing correctly all minutes of their meetings and of resolutions passed and proceedings taken thereat, and such book or books shall at all reasonable times be open for inspection by the minister in charge of the congregation and by the Chairman of the Committee of Stewards, and any person or persons named by them or either of them, and the said minister or the said chairman and any person named by them or either of them as aforesaid shall have the right to make such copies or abstracts of or extracts from the said accounts or minutes, as he or they may desire, and upon request from the Committee of Stewards the Trustees shall submit all books of accounts and minutes, and all vouchers, receipts, papers and documents relating to the said accounts, for audit by the Committee of Stewards, or such person or persons as the said Committee may appoint for the purpose.

8. The trustees shall have seven days' notice of all special meetings and one day's notice of other meetings.

8. Every meeting of Trustees for considering the making of any alteration of or addition to any building on the said lands, or any part thereof, or for considering the sale, mortgage, hypothecation, lease or exchange of the said lands, or any part thereof, except the letting or sale of pews, seats, vaults, tombs or burial plots, or for considering any litigation or legal proceedings in connection with the trust estate, shall be deemed a special meeting, and each member shall be entitled to seven days' notice in writing thereof, specifying the time, place and purpose of such meeting. Such notice shall be either personally delivered to each Trustee, or mailed to or delivered to him or her at his or her usual place of abode or business. Ordinary meetings may be called at any time by giving at least one day's notice in writing to each Trustee in the manner aforesaid, or by public announcement at a service for public worship at least one day prior to such meeting. Meetings may be called by the minister in charge of the congregation, or by at least two of the Trustees. Notwithstanding anything herein contained no meeting or any business transacted thereat shall be invalid by reason of any lack or defect of service of notice arising from inability to ascertain the usual place of abode or business of any Trustee. All questions shall be determined by the majority vote of the Trustees present at a meeting, and the Chairman shall have a casting vote in the event of a tie. The minister of such congregation shall have the right to preside as Chairman at all meetings of the Trustee and may

appoint a deputy to act in his place in his absence, and in the absence of the Minister and of any such deputy the Trustees present may elect a Chairman from among themselves.

9. The number of said trustees shall not be fewer than three or more than fifteen provided that where the number of existing trustees is more than fifteen all such trustees shall remain in office but that no vacancy in the office of trustee shall be filled until the number of trustees is reduced below fifteen, in which case the number shall not again exceed fifteen. In case any of the said Trustees or any Trustee appointed under this provision shall, during his or her term of office, die, resign or cease to be a member of the United Church of Canada in full communion, or remove to such a distance, or fail to attend meetings for such period not less than one year, as shall in the opinion of his or her co-trustees expressed by a two-thirds vote of said co-trustees, render it inexpedient for him or her to remain a trustee, or in case the said congregation shall think proper to remove a trustee from his or her office as Trustee, it shall be lawful for the said congregation, at any meeting called by notice from the pulpit during public worship on each of the two next preceding Sundays, to declare by the votes of two-thirds of the members then present that such Trustee has ceased to be a Trustee of the said congregation, and such person shall thereupon cease to be a Trustee, and at the same meeting it shall be lawful for the said congregation by a like vote to appoint a successor to such Trustee provided, however, that no Trustee who is personally liable for payment of any indebtedness in respect of the property of a congregation shall be removed without his consent unless indemnified to his satisfaction in respect of any such liability. If no successor shall be appointed at such meeting a meeting may be called in like manner for the purpose of filling such vacancy, and at such meeting a new Trustee or new Trustees (as the case may require) shall be appointed by the votes of the majority of the members then present. The notice calling a meeting for the purpose of declaring or filling a vacancy or vacancies in the office of Trustee shall be read from the pulpit by the minister or person officiating as minister, at the request of any Trustee, or of any seven members of the congregation, and every such meeting may be adjourned from time to time by the vote of the majority of the members present. During any vacancy in the office of Trustee, the remaining Trustees, not being fewer than five in number, shall have all the powers of the full Board. A majority of the Trustees shall form a quorum save when the number of Trus-

9. The number of trustees shall not be fewer than three or more than fifteen, and vacancies shall be filled by election by the congregation, or in default of such election, by the Presbytery, and the property of a congregation which ceases to exist shall be subject to the trusts determined by the Conference.

tees exceeds nine, in which case five shall form a quorum. The majority of the Trustees shall be members of the United Church of Canada.

A minute of every such appointment of a Trustee shall be entered in a book to be kept for the purpose, and signed by the person presiding at the meeting, and such minute so signed shall be sufficient evidence of the fact that the person or persons therein named was or were appointed and elected at such meeting, but any omission or neglect to make or sign such minute shall not invalidate such appointment or election.

And it is hereby further declared that in case there shall be at any time fewer than five Trustees, the presiding officer or Clerk of the Presbytery within whose bounds and under whose jurisdiction the said congregation shall be, shall, with the remaining Trustee or Trustees, be the Trustees under these presents until the full Board is duly appointed, and at any time thereafter the Presbytery may cause notice to be given from the pulpit on two consecutive Sundays requiring the said congregation to proceed with the appointment of new Trustees. And if the said congregation shall not in the meantime have appointed new Trustees in the manner hereinbefore provided, it shall be lawful for the said Presbytery at any time after four weeks from the last giving of such notice by resolution duly entered in the minutes of the Presbytery to appoint new Trustees. Such appointment shall be communicated to the congregation by notice from the pulpit as soon as conveniently may be thereafter, and from the time of such communication the Trustee or Trustees so appointed shall be a Trustee or Trustees hereunder.

And it is further declared that if at any time there shall cease to be an organized congregation entitled to the use, benefit and enjoyment of the said lands, it shall be lawful at any time or times for the said Presbytery to fill any vacancy in the number of Trustees, and the said lands shall thenceforth be held subject to such trusts and for such purposes for the benefit of the United Church of Canada as the Conference within the bounds of which the said lands are situate may determine under the by-laws, rules and regulations of the General Council.

10. Trustees shall not be liable for involuntary loss.

10. A Trustee shall not be responsible for the failure of any investment or security made or taken by the Trustees or for anything done in connection with the trust estate except for his own acts and to account for any moneys coming into his own hands, and shall not be liable for injury done by others to the said trust premises, or to any part thereof.

(*e*) PROPOSED PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION.

Except where noted in the margin, the sections of the bills in all the Provinces of Canada will be identical.

Whereas the Petitioners hereinafter named have represented that the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Methodist Church and the Congregational Churches of Canada have agreed to unite and form one body or denomination of Christians under the name of "The United Church of Canada" in accordance with the terms and provisions of a Basis of Union agreed upon by them and that they have petitioned the Parliament of Canada for an Act to incorporate the Church to be formed by the said Union under the name "The United Church of Canada."

And whereas the Petitioners have prayed that an Act be passed by the Legislature of this Province to ratify and confirm the said Union and to enact as hereinafter set forth with regard to the property, rights and powers hereinafter mentioned.

And whereas it is expedient to grant the prayer of the said petition.

Therefore, etc. (here follows the enacting clause in the appropriate form for each Province.)

1. This Act may be cited as "The United Church of Canada Act". **Short title.**

2. In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, the expression— **Definitions.**

(*a*) "The negotiating churches" means the churches mentioned in the preamble, and shall include also every congregation heretofore in connection or in communion with any of the negotiating churches which prior to the coming into force of this Act has joined with any one or more congregation or congregations of any of the other negotiating churches for purposes of worship, and every congregation affiliated with any of the negotiating churches, and every congregation ordinarily known as a local union church whether it holds its property separately from or as a part of any of the negotiating churches and every congregation having any representation in or connection with the General Council of local union churches. **"The Negotiating Churches."**

(*b*) "The Basis of Union" means the Basis of Union mentioned in the preamble and to be set forth in Schedule "A" to the Act of the Parliament of Canada by which The United Church of Canada shall be incorporated. **"The Basis of Union."**

(*c*) "Congregation" means any local church, charge, circuit, congregation or other local unit for purposes of worship in connection or in communion with any of the negotiating churches or of The United Church of Canada. **"Congregation."**

(*d*) "College" means any college, school or other educational institution, incorporated or unincorporated, under the government or control of, or in connection with, any of the negotiating churches, or established or maintained in whole or in part by any of them, and shall include the colleges and institutions set out in Schedule "B" to this Act. **"College."**

(*e*) "The Presbyterian Church in Canada" shall include the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax, the Board of Trustees of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, Eastern Section, the Board of Trustees of the Century Church and Manse Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, Eastern Section, the Church and Manse Board of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Board for the management of the Temporalities Fund of the **"The Presbyterian Church in Canada."**

In Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

Presbyterian Church of Canada, the Managers of the Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, and all Presbyterian congregations in this Province separately incorporated under any Statute of the Dominion of Canada or of this Province and all congregations heretofore and now connected with the Presbyterian Church in Canada whether the same shall have been organized under the provisions of any Statute or Deed of Trust or Act of incorporation, or as union or as joint stock churches or otherwise howsoever.

In Quebec.

(*e*) "The Presbyterian Church in Canada" shall include the Board of Trustees of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Church and Manse Board of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Board of Trustees for the Presbyterian Church of Montreal, the Board for the management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, the Managers of the Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church in Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, and all Presbyterian congregations separately incorporated under any Statute of the Dominion of Canada or of the Province of Quebec, and all congregations heretofore and now connected with the Presbyterian Church in Canada, however organized.

In Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia.

(*e*) "The Presbyterian Church in Canada" shall include the Board of Trustees of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Church and Manse Board of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Board for the management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, the Managers of the Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland and all Presbyterian congregations separately incorporated under any Statute of the Dominion of Canada or of this Province and all congregations heretofore and now connected or in communion with the Presbyterian Church in Canada however organized.

In all Provinces

(*e*) To be amended to include names of any additional corporations submitted by the Presbyterian Committee on Church Union.

"The Methodist Church."

In Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

(*f*) "The Methodist Church" shall include the body corporate known as The Methodist Church and all bodies corporate established or created by the Methodist Church or any conference thereof under the provisions of any Statute of the Parliament of Canada or the Legislature of this Province, and all Methodist congregations separately incorporated under any Statute of this Province.

In Quebec.

(*f*) "The Methodist Church" shall include the body corporate known as The Methodist Church and all bodies corporate, established or created by the Methodist Church or any conference thereof under the provisions of any Statute of the Parliament of Canada or the Legislature of the Province of Quebec.

In Ontario.

(*f*) "The Methodist Church" shall include the body corporate known as The Methodist Church and all bodies corporate established or created by the Methodist Church or any conference thereof under the provisions of any Statute of the Parliament of Canada or the Legislature of the Province of Ontario, and The Methodist Union of Toronto.

In Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia.

(*f*) "The Methodist Church" shall include the body corporate known as The Methodist Church and all bodies corporate established or created by the Methodist Church or any conference thereof under the provisions of any Statute of the Parliament of Canada or the Legislature of this Province.

In all Provinces

(*f*) To be amended to include names of any additional corporations submitted by the Methodist Committee on Church Union.

"Congregational Churches."

In Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

(*g*) "Congregational Churches" shall include The Congregational Union of Canada, The Congregational Union of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, the Canada Congregational Missionary Society, the Canada Congregational Foreign Missionary Society, the Congregational Provident Fund Society, and all congregations of the Congregational denomination in this Province separately incorporated under any Statute of the Dominion of Canada or of this Province, and all other congregations thereof whether the same shall have been organized under the provisions of any Statute or Deed of Trust or Act of incorporation, or as union or as joint stock churches or otherwise howsoever.

In Quebec.

(*g*) "Congregational Churches" shall include The Congregational Union of Canada, the Canada Congregational Missionary Society, the Canada Congregational Foreign Missionary Society, the Montreal Congregational Church Building Fund Society, the Congregational Provident Fund Society, and all congregations of the Congregational denomination in the Province of Quebec separately incorporated under any Statute of the Dominion of Canada or of the Province of Quebec, and all congregations thereof within Quebec, however organized.

In Ontario.

(*g*) "Congregational Churches" shall include The Congregational Union of Canada, The Canada Congregational Missionary Society, The Canada Congregational Foreign Missionary Society, the Congregational Provident Fund Society and all congregations of the Congregational denomination incorporated under any Statute of the Dominion of Canada or of the Province of Ontario and all congregations thereof however organized.

In Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia

(*g*) "Congregational Churches" shall include The Congregational Union of Canada, the Canada Congregational Missionary Society, the Canada Congregational Foreign Missionary Society, the Congregational Provident Fund Society, the Congregational Church Extension Society of Western Canada, and all congregations of the Congregational denomination separately incorporated under any Statute of the Dominion of Canada or of this Province, and all congregations thereof however organized.

In all Provinces

(*g*) To be amended to include names of any additional corporations submitted by the Congregational Committee on Church Union.

"The United Church."

(*h*) "The United Church" means "The United Church of Canada."

"The Act of Incorporation."

(*i*) "The Act of Incorporation" means the Act of the Parliament of Canada by which the United Church shall be incorporated.

General Property Vested in the United Church.

3. Save as hereinafter provided, all property, real and personal, within this Province, belonging to or held in trust for or to the use of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Methodist Church, and the Congregational Churches, or belonging to or held in trust for or to the use of any corporation, board, committee or other body, whether incorporated or unincorporated,

created by or under the government or control of, or in connection with, any of the said churches, shall henceforth be vested in the United Church, to be held, used and administered, subject to the provisions of this Act, in accordance with the terms and provisions of the Basis of Union.

Congregational Property.

4. Subject to the provisions of section six hereof, all property, real and personal, within this Province, belonging to or held by or in trust for or to the use of any congregation of any of the negotiating churches, shall henceforth be held, used and administered for the benefit of the same congregation as a part of the United Church in the manner and upon the trusts and subject to the terms and provisions set forth in Schedule "A" to this Act and Schedule "B" to the Act of Incorporation, or in any amendment to said Schedule "B" made by any Act of the Parliament of Canada, and all property, real and personal, within this Province hereafter acquired for or belonging to or held by or in trust for or to the use of any congregation of the United Church shall be held, used and administered for the benefit of the said congregation as a part of the United Church upon the said trusts and subject to the said terms and provisions. Provided that any property, real or personal, now held or hereafter acquired by devise, bequest, transfer or gift, in trust for any special use of any congregation, shall be held, used, and administered in accordance with the special trusts so declared in respect thereof, not being contrary to law or to any by-law, rule or regulation of the United Church, and that in the event of failure or partial failure of any of the said trusts, the said property may be held, used, administered or disposed of as may be provided by any by-law, rule or regulation made from time to time by the United Church.

Short Form of Trust Deed.

5. In any deed, conveyance or transfer to trustees upon the trusts set forth in said Schedule "A" the form of words contained in Column 1 of said Schedule "A" and distinguished by any number therein, shall have the same effect as if it contained the form of words in Column 2 of said Schedule "A," distinguished by the same number as is annexed to the form of words used in such deed, conveyance or transfer, but it shall not be necessary in any such deed, conveyance or transfer to insert any such number.

Special Property of Certain Congregations.

6. The rights of the several congregations named in Schedule "C" to this Act in regard to their respective properties therein set out, or, with the approval of the Presbytery within whose bounds such property is situate, of any congregation hereafter received into the United Church in regard to any real or personal property belonging to or held by or in trust for or to the use of such congregation, solely for its own benefit, shall not be subject to the provisions of sections three and four hereof, or to the control of the United Church, unless and until any such congregation at a meeting thereof duly called for the purpose shall consent that such provisions shall apply to any such property or a specified part thereof.

Existing Trustees Continued.

7. All trustees acting in any of the trusts referred to in section four hereof shall notwithstanding any irregularity in their appointment, and notwithstanding that their number shall not correspond with the number named in the deed of conveyance of the property subject to such trusts, or any of them, be deemed to be and shall be the trustees of the said properties respectively, and shall henceforth hold the same upon and subject to the

trusts set out in Schedule "A" to this Act and in Schedule "B" to the Act of Incorporation and any amendment of said Schedule "B" made by any Act of the Parliament of Canada.

Property of non-concurring congregations not affected.

8. Provided always that if any congregation in connection or communion with any of the negotiating churches shall, at a meeting of the congregation regularly called and held within six months after the passing of this Act, decide by a majority of votes of the persons in full membership whose names are on the roll of the church, present at such meeting, not to concur in the said union of the said churches, but to withdraw therefrom, then and in such case the property, real and personal, belonging to or held in trust for, or to the use of, such congregation shall remain unaffected by this Act, and the congregation shall also be entitled as one of the non-concurring congregations therein named, to the benefit of the provisions made in the Act of Incorporation for non-concurring congregations. Should such congregation so decide at any later time to enter into the union and become part of the United Church then this Act shall apply to the congregation and all the property thereof from the date of such decision.

Powers of Commission in the Province.

9. (*a*) Any Commission appointed as provided by the Act of Incorporation shall have and may exercise within this Province all powers, rights and privileges conferred or intended to be conferred upon it by the Act of Incorporation, and any determination, decision, order or direction made or given by any such Commission pursuant to the said Act of Incorporation shall have full force and effect with respect to any property or civil rights within this Province affected thereby.

Enforcement of Orders.

(*b*) Any orders of any such Commission may be enforced within this Province in the same manner as a judgment of the (naming the Superior Court of the Province).

Liability for Debts.

10. (*a*) All property belonging to or held by or in trust for or to the use of any congregation of the negotiating churches henceforth to be held, used and administered for the benefit of the same congregation as a part of the United Church, shall remain liable for the payment or satisfaction of any debts or obligations contracted or incurred in respect thereto to the same extent as it would have been liable had this Act not been passed but the United Church shall not be or become liable for any of said debts or obligations and, save as aforesaid, no property of the United Church shall be liable for any debts or obligations contracted or incurred by any congregation in connection or in communion with any of the negotiating churches.

(*b*) The United Church, upon receiving, taking or acquiring any property of any of the negotiating churches or of any corporation, board, committee or other body, whether incorporated or unincorporated, created by or under the government or control of or in connection with any of the negotiating churches vested by this Act in the United Church, shall, except as hereinafter provided, become liable for all debts and obligations contracted or incurred by any of the negotiating churches or by any such corporation, board, committee, or other body, provided, however, that this section shall not be deemed to include or apply to any of the property first mentioned in the next preceding subsection.

Colleges.

11. The provisions of section three hereof shall not apply to any property, real or personal, belonging to or held in trust for or to the use of any college named in Schedule "B" to this Act, or belonging to or held by or vested in any board of trustees,

board of directors, board of governors, regents, or other board or committee or body having the control or management of the property or affairs of any college named in said Schedule "B." From and after the passing of the Act of Incorporation the colleges named in said Schedule "B" and all such boards, regents or other committees or bodies as aforesaid shall have the same connection with and stand in the same relation to the United Church as they respectively had and stood with and to any of the negotiating churches immediately prior to the passing of the Act of Incorporation, and all rights, powers, authorities and privileges in respect of the said colleges, or any of them, of or vested in any Assembly, Conference, Synod, Presbytery, Council or other governing body of any of the negotiating churches or any officer or board thereof, shall be vested in the General Council of the United Church provided that the General Council may declare that the said rights, powers, authorities and privileges, or any of them, shall be vested in a Conference, Presbytery or other governing body of the United Church, or otherwise, as it may deem expedient and from and after such declaration such rights, powers, authorities and privileges, or any of them, shall vest in accordance with the terms of such declaration. In all cases where a college corporation consists of the ministers and members, or the members, or any officers of any of the negotiating churches, or of any governing body thereof (whether with or without named persons), such corporation shall after the passing of the Act of Incorporation consist of the ministers and members of the United Church. All rights, powers, authorities and privileges in respect of the said Colleges vested in any congregation in connection or in communion with any of the negotiating churches, or in any minister and congregation thereof, shall continue to be held and exercised by the said congregation or by the said minister and congregation in connection with the United Church. Nothing in this section contained shall be construed so as in anywise to repeal, alter, affect or vary any existing legislation of this Province relating to any of the said colleges except in so far as may be necessary to give full force and effect to the provisions of the Act of Incorporation and of this Act.

Religious Teaching in Colleges.

12. Notwithstanding anything contained in any Act of the Parliament of Canada or of this Province or in any Act, by-law, rule, regulation, declaration or other proceeding of any of the negotiating churches or any governing or subordinate court or body of any of them, or in the constitution, by-laws, rules or regulations of or in relation to any of the said colleges respecting the principles, doctrines or religious standards to be taught and maintained in any such college, the principles, doctrines and religious standards to be taught and maintained in the said colleges from and after the passing of the Act of Incorporation shall be the principles, doctrines and religious standards set out in the Basis of Union or determined or prescribed from time to time by the General Council of the United Church in accordance with the Act of Incorporation, and the teaching or maintenance in any of the said colleges of the said principles, doctrines and religious standards so set out or so hereinafter determined or prescribed shall not be deemed to be a change of adherence on the part of any such college or a change of its principles or doctrines or religious standards or a breach of the provisions of any Statute, Act, by-law, rule, regulation, declaration or other proceeding,

or constitution, and shall not be deemed to be a breach of any trust relating to property devised, bequeathed, given to or otherwise acquired by or for the benefit of any such college with respect to the teaching or maintenance of any principles, doctrines or religious standards in any of the said colleges, but shall be deemed to be in compliance with and a performance of any such provisions or trusts.

Existing Trusts Continued.

13. Where prior to the passing of the Act of Incorporation any existing trust has been created or declared in any manner whatsoever for any special purpose or object having regard to the teaching, preaching or maintenance of any principles, doctrines or religious standards, or the support, assistance, or maintenance of any congregation or minister or charity, or for the furtherance of any religious, charitable, educational, congregation or social purpose, in connection with any of the negotiating churches, such trust shall continue to exist and to be performed as nearly as may be for the like purposes or objects in connection with the United Church as the United Church may determine, and anything done in pursuance of the Act of Incorporation or of this Act shall not be deemed to be a breach of any such trust, but shall be deemed to be in compliance therewith and a performance thereof, and the entry of any congregation into the United Church shall not be deemed a change of its adherence or principles or doctrines or religious standards within the meaning of any such trust.

Establishment of Boards and Committees.

14. (*a*) The United Church may by resolution of the General Council establish boards or committees of its members to hold, manage, deal with, dispose of or otherwise administer any of its property, funds, trusts, interests, institutions and religious or charitable schemes now or hereafter owned, founded or established, define and prescribe the constitution, powers, duties, officers and quorum of any such board or committee, and may delegate to any of them such powers as it may deem expedient.

Establishment of Boards and Committees as Bodies Corporate.

(*b*) Whenever it is deemed expedient to establish as a body corporate any board, committee or other body for any of the purposes of the United Church relating to property or civil rights in this Province, the United Church may establish by resolution of the General Council, or may authorize and empower any Conference to establish by resolution of such Conference, any such boards, committees or other bodies, including city mission boards and church extension boards, in accordance with the by-laws, rules and regulations of the United Church in that behalf, and if any such resolution declares such board, committee or other body to be a body corporate then, upon the filing of the certificate or certificates in this section hereinafter mentioned, the same shall be and become a body corporate with such membership, organization, powers, rights and duties not contrary to law nor inconsistent with the Act of Incorporation as may be defined from time to time by the General Council, or such Conference, as the case may be, including the acquiring, holding, administering and disposing of all property, real or personal, which may be devised, bequeathed, granted or conveyed to any such board, committee or other body for the purposes of the United Church, (but when established by resolution of a Conference then only within the bounds of such Conference) and the borrowing of any money necessary in the opinion of such board, committee or body for the purposes thereof, and the mortgaging, hypothecating or pledging of so much of the real or personal property held by any such board, committee or body as may be necessary to secure any amount so borrowed. In case such board, committee or other body is established by resolution of the General Council, the General Council shall file a certified copy of such resolution under the hand of its presiding officer and its secretary or clerk with the Secretary of State for Canada, and in case such board, committee or other body is established by resolution of any Conference the bounds of which are wholly or partly within this Province, such Conference shall file a certified copy of such resolution under the hand of its presiding officer and its secretary or clerk with the Provincial Secretary. A certificate under the official seal of the General Council, or of the Conference by which any such board, committee or body is established, as the case may be, signed by its secretary or clerk shall be sufficient evidence in all Courts of the establishment of such board, committee or body and of its constitution and powers.

Power to Acquire and Dispose of Property.

15. The United Church shall have power to acquire by purchase, lease, gift, devise or bequest any real or personal property in this Province, or any estate or interest therein, either absolutely or in trust, and subject to the provisions of sections 4 and 6 of this Act, to sell, transfer, exchange, mortgage, hypothecate, lease or otherwise dispose of the same or any part thereof, and to give, grant, convey, lease or otherwise alienate any property, real or personal, in this Province to any other church or religious body or organization, or to any board, committee, trustees or governing body thereof as it may deem expedient in pursuance of any agreement or understanding with such church or religious body or organization for the purpose of co-operation in the prosecution of religious work. Provided always that no land at any time acquired by the United Church and not required for its actual use and occupation, or by way of security for the payment of any loan, debt or guarantee, shall be held by it, or by any trustee on its behalf, for a longer period than ten years after it shall have ceased to be so required, but this proviso shall not be deemed in anywise to vary or otherwise affect any trust relating to such property.

Proviso.

Appointment of Subordinate Bodies.

16. The United Church may exercise the powers conferred by the next preceding section of this Act, or any of them, by and through such boards, committees or other bodies as the General Council or any Conference or any Presbytery acting within their respective jurisdictions under the provisions of the Basis of Union may from time to time establish or appoint and may determine the method of appointment or election thereof and may define and prescribe the constitution, powers, duties, officers and quorum of such boards, committees or other bodies.

Exercise of Powers within the Province.

17. The United Church and all boards, committees or other bodies established, appointed or created by it pursuant to the provisions of the Act of Incorporation or of any Act in amendment thereof passed by the Parliament of Canada, or of this Act, shall have and may exercise within this Province all rights, powers and privileges conferred or intended to be conferred upon it or them by such Acts or any of them.

Approval of Conference required in certain cases.

18. The provision in the Basis of Union that the approval of the Conference in which property is situated is required to enable the General Council to legislate in respect thereof shall be deemed to apply only to such property as belongs to or is held in trust for or to the use of a congregation or as belongs

to or is held in trust for or is set apart for or used for the purposes of such Conference.

19. The United Church, and any board or committee thereof or appointed thereby or by any Conference thereof, having charge of any of the funds or property of the United Church, and the trustees of any congregation of the United Church in this Province, provided that such trustees first obtain the consent in writing of the Presbytery within the bounds of which the lands of such congregation are situate, may issue debentures in such denominations and upon such terms as it or they may deem expedient under the hand or hands of such officer or officers as may be thereto authorized and the seal (if any) of such United Church, board, committee or trustees issuing the same, for any money borrowed under the authority of this Act, and the payment of such debentures and the interest thereon may be secured by mortgage in favor of a trustee or trustees for the holders of such debentures upon any real estate in this Province under the control of the United Church or of such board or committee thereof or of the trustees of such congregation.

Issue of Debentures.

20. The trustees now or hereafter holding any property in trust for the use or benefit of any congregation in connection with the United Church referred to in section four of this Act, and their successors, shall be a body corporate having perpetual succession by the name of the trustees of the United Church of Canada at (the place where is situate the trust property, or the church for the benefit of the congregation worshipping in which the property is held in trust) or by such other name as is or shall be mentioned in the Trust Deed or other Act or instrument by which the trusts respectively are or shall be created, and by that name shall be capable of taking by grant or devise, holding and possessing the lands, tenements, moneys and other property heretofore or hereafter conveyed, devised, bequeathed, given, granted or sold to them and of suing and being sued in any of His Majesty's Courts of law or equity, and of having a common seal with power to break or renew the same at pleasure and of having and exercising all the rights, powers, and privileges incident to a body corporate according to the laws of the Province of New Brunswick and not inconsistent with this Act. Provided that in the exercise of such rights, powers and privileges the said body corporate shall be subject to the provisions of this Act and to the trusts set out in Schedule "A" hereto or in Schedule "B" to the Act of Incorporation or in any amendment to said Schedule "B" made by any Act of the Parliament of Canada.

Incorporation of Trustees.

In New Brunswick only.

20. (*a*) When any Master of Titles or Local Master of Titles in the Province of Ontario is satisfied by any evidence he may require that any real property standing in the name of any individual or individuals, whether such persons or any of them be deceased or not, actually belongs to or is held in trust for or to the use of any congregation upon the trusts mentioned in section four of this Act, he may cancel the certificate of title standing in the name or names of such individual or individuals and may issue a new certificate of title for said real property in the names of the then trustees of such congregation to be held in accordance with the provisions of the said section. A certificate of the secretary or clerk of the Presbytery within the bounds of which such property is situate together with an

New Certificates of Title in Name of Trustees.

In Ontario only.

affidavit of the minister in charge of such congregation to the effect that such property belongs to or is held in trust for or to the use of such congregation shall be accepted by such Master of Titles or local Master of Titles as conclusive evidence.

Deeds and Other Assurances by Trustees Validated.

(*b*) All deeds, transfers, mortgages, leases or other assurances of any land in the Province of Ontario heretofore or hereafter executed and purporting to be signed by the trustees of any congregation in section four mentioned, or a majority of them, shall be in all Courts in this Province, and in all Registry Offices and in all Land Titles Offices of this Province, deemed sufficiently executed to pass or grant or mortgage or lease (as the case may be) the estate or interest thereby purported to be passed, granted, mortgaged or leased. Provided that the minister in charge of such congregation shall by affidavit certify that the persons executing such instrument were at the date thereof trustees for said congregation, and in the absence or want of appointment or inability to act of any minister, such certificate may with like effect be granted by the presiding officer, secretary or clerk of the Presbytery within the bounds of which the said lands are situate. The signature of the said minister or presiding officer or secretary or clerk shall be duly witnessed and verified by affidavit in the same manner as required by the Registry Act or the Land Titles Act as the case may be; Provided further that nothing in this section contained shall be construed to dispense with the consent of the Presbytery or Conference, as the case may be, required by any term or provision set forth in Schedule "A" to this Act with respect to any sale, mortgage, lease or exchange of lands by such trustees.

In Ontario only.

Trusts not to be Registered in Full.

(*c*) In registering any instrument under The Registry Act which sets out or refers to the trusts contained in Schedule "A" to this Act or Schedule "B" to the Act of Incorporation, or any amendment to said Schedule "B" made by any Act of the Parliament of Canada, it shall not be necessary to register the said trusts in full but the Registrar shall enter a note or memorandum upon the record of title of each lot or parcel of land affected thereby, giving the title and chapter of the Act of Incorporation and of this Act and the respective dates of the passing thereof and stating that such land is subject to the trusts thereby created.

In Ontario only.

Trusts not to be Set Out in Documents under Land Titles Act.

(*d*) If the lands affected by the said trusts are registered under the Land Titles Act, it shall not be necessary to set out the said trusts in any transfer or in any certificate of title in respect of said lands, provided however that the Master of Titles or Local Master of Titles shall, upon receiving notice from the presiding officer, secretary or clerk of the Presbytery within the bounds of which the said lands may be situate that such lands are affected by this Act, enter a note or memorandum giving the title and chapter of the Act of Incorporation and of this Act and the respective dates of the passing thereof upon the record of title of each lot and parcel of land affected thereby and stating that such lands are subject to the said trusts, and shall on each certificate of title thereafter issued by him with respect to the said lands enter a note or memorandum to the effect that the property therein described is subject to the trusts created by the said Acts.

In Ontario only.

New Certificates of Title in Names of Trustees.

20. (*a*) When the District Registrar of any Land Titles District in this Province is satisfied by any evidence he may require that any real property standing in the name of any individual

or individuals, whether such persons, or any of them, be deceased or not actually belongs to or is held in trust for or to the use of any congregation upon the trusts mentioned in section 4 of this Act, he may cancel the certificate of title standing in the name or names of such individual or individuals and may issue a new certificate of title for said real property in the names of the then trustees of such congregation to be held in accordance with the provisions of the said section. A certificate of the secretary or clerk of the Presbytery within the bounds of which such property is situate together with a certificate of the minister in charge of such congregation to the effect that such property belongs to or is held in trust for or to the use of such congregation shall be accepted by such District Registrar as conclusive evidence.

In Manitoba only.

Deeds and Other Assurances by Trustees Validated.

(*b*) All deeds, transfers, mortgages, leases or other assurances of any lands in Manitoba heretofore or hereafter executed and purporting to be signed by the trustees of any congregation in section four mentioned, or a majority of them, shall be in all Courts in this Province and in the Land Titles Offices of this Province deemed sufficiently executed to pass or grant or mortgage or lease, as the case may be, the estate or interest thereby purported to be passed, granted, mortgaged or leased. Provided that the minister in charge of such congregation shall by affidavit certify that the persons executing such instruments were at the date thereof trustees for said congregation, and in the absence or want of appointment or inability to act of any minister, such certificate may with like effect be granted by the presiding officer, secretary or clerk of the Presbytery within the bounds of which the said lands are situate. The signature of the said minister or presiding officer or secretary or clerk shall be duly witnessed and verified by affidavit in the same manner as required by The Land Titles Act; Provided further that nothing in this section contained shall be construed to dispense with the consent of the Presbytery or Conference, as the case may be, required by any term or provision set forth in Schedule "A" to this Act with respect to any sale, mortgage, lease or exchange of lands by such trustees.

In Manitoba only.

Trusts not to be Entered in Full or Set Out in Documents

(*c*) When any land under the operation of The Real Property Act stands in the names of any trustees for any congregation, the said trustees shall hold said lands upon the trusts mentioned in Schedule "A" to this Act or Schedule "B" to the Act of Incorporation or any amendment to said Schedule "B" made by any Act of the Parliament of Canada, but it shall not be necessary to set out the said trusts in full but the District Registrar shall enter a note or memorandum upon the record of title of each lot or parcel of land affected thereby, giving the title and chapter of the Act of Incorporation and of this Act and the respective dates of the passing thereof and stating that such land is subject to the trusts thereby created and shall enter a similar note or memorandum on each certificate of title thereafter issued by him with respect to such lands.

In Manitoba only.

New Certificates of Title in Names of Trustees.

20. (*a*) When any Registrar of any Land Titles Office in this Province is satisfied by any evidence he may require that any real property standing in the name of any individual or individuals, whether such persons, or any of them, be deceased or not actually belongs to or is held in trust for or to the use of any congregation upon the trusts mentioned in section 4 of this Act, he may cancel the certificate of title standing in the name or names

In Saskatchewan and Alberta only.

of such individual or individuals and may issue a new certificate of title for said real property in the names of the then trustees of such congregation to be held in accordance with the provisions of the said section. A certificate of the secretary or clerk of the Presbytery within the bounds of which such property is situate together with a certificate of the minister in charge of such congregation to the effect that such property belongs to or is held in trust for or to the use of such congregation shall be accepted by such Registrar as conclusive evidence.

Deeds and other Assurances Validated.

(*b*) All deeds, transfers, mortgages, leases or other assurances of any lands in this Province heretofore or hereafter executed and purporting to be signed by the trustees of any congregation in section four mentioned, or a majority of them, shall be in all Courts in this Province, and in all Lands Titles Offices in this Province, deemed sufficiently executed to pass or grant or mortgage or lease (as the case may be) the estate or interest thereby purported to be passed, granted, mortgaged or leased.

In Saskatchewan and Alberta only.

Provided that the minister in charge of such congregation shall by affidavit certify that the persons executing such instruments were at the date thereof trustees for said congregation, and in the absence or want of appointment or inability to act of any minister, such certificate may with like effect be granted by the presiding officer, secretary or clerk of the Presbytery within the bounds of which the said lands are situate. The signature of the said minister or presiding officer or secretary or clerk shall be duly witnessed and verified by affidavit in the same manner as required by The Land Titles Act: Provided further that nothing in this section contained shall be construed to dispense with the consent of the Presbytery or Conference, as the case may be, required by any term or provision set forth in Schedule "A" to this Act with respect to any sale, mortgage, lease or exchange of lands by such trustees.

Trusts not to be Entered in Full nor Set Out in Documents.

(*c*) It shall not be necessary to set out the said trusts in any transfer or in any certificate of title in respect of said lands, provided however that the Registrar shall, upon receiving notice from the presiding officer, secretary or clerk of the Presbytery within the bounds of which the said lands may be situate that such lands are affected by this Act, enter a note or memorandum giving the title and chapter of the Act of Incorporation and of this Act and the respective dates of the passing thereof upon the record of title of each lot and parcel of land affected thereby and stating that such lands are subject to the said trusts, and shall on each certificate of title thereafter issued by him with respect to the said lands enter a note or memorandum to the effect that the property therein described is subject to the trusts created by the said Act.

In Saskatchewan and Alberta only.

New Certificates of Title in Names of Trustees.

20. (*a*) When any Registrar General of Titles or Deputy Registrar of Titles in this Province is satisfied by any evidence he may require that any real property standing in the name of any individual or individuals, whether such persons, or any of them, be deceased or not actually belongs to or is held in trust for or to the use of any congregation upon the trusts mentioned in section 4 of this Act, he may cancel the certificate of title standing in the name or names of such individual or individuals and may issue a new certificate of title for said real property in the names of the then trustees of such congregation to be held in accordance with the provisions of the said section. A certificate of the secretary or clerk of the Presbytery within

In British Columbia only.

the bounds of which such property is situate together with a certificate of the minister in charge of such congregation to the effect that such property belongs to or is held in trust for or to the use of such congregation shall be accepted by such Registrar General of Titles or Deputy Registrar of Titles as conclusive evidence.

Deeds and Other Assurances Validated.

(*b*) All deeds, transfers, mortgages, leases or other assurances of any lands in the Province of British Columbia heretofore or hereafter executed and purporting to be signed by the trustees of any congregation in section four mentioned, or a majority of them, shall be in all Courts in this Province, and in all Land Registry Offices in this Province, deemed sufficiently executed to pass or grant or mortgage or lease (as the case may be) the estate or interest thereby purported to be passed, granted, mortgaged or leased. Provided that the minister in charge of such congregation shall by affidavit certify that the persons executing such instruments were at the date thereof trustees for said congregation, and in the absence or want of appointment or inability to act of any minister, such certificate may with like effect be granted by the presiding officer, secretary or clerk of the Presbytery within the bounds of which the said lands are situate. The signature of the said minister or presiding officer or secretary or clerk shall be duly witnessed and verified by affidavit in the same manner as required by The Land Registry Act; Provided further that nothing in this section contained shall be construed to dispense with the consent of the Presbytery or Conference, as the case may be, required by any term or provision set forth in Schedule "A" to this Act with respect to any sale, mortgage, lease or exchange of lands by such trustees.

In British Columbia only.

Trusts not to be Entered in Full nor Set Out in Documents.

(*c*) It shall not be necessary to set out the said trusts in any transfer or in any certificate of title in respect of said lands, provided however that the Registrar shall, upon receiving notice from the presiding officer, secretary or clerk of the Presbytery within the bounds of which the said lands may be situate that such lands are affected by this Act, enter a note or memorandum giving the title and chapter of the Act of Incorporation and of this Act and the respective dates of the passing thereof upon the record of title of each lot and parcel of land affected thereby and stating that such lands are subject to the said trusts, and shall on each certificate of title thereafter issued by him with respect to the said lands enter a note or memorandum to the effect that the property therein described is subject to the trusts created by the said Act.

In British Columbia only.

Effect of General Legislation as to Religious Societies.

21. The provisions of this Act shall not be repealed, altered, affected, or varied by any of the provisions of any general Act respecting the property of religious societies, congregations, or institutions in force in the Province of Quebec, but the provisions of any such general Act shall, when not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, be construed as supplementary thereto.

In all Provinces Except Ontario.

Solemnization of Marriage and Keeping of Registers of Civil Status.

22. Ministers or clergymen of the United Church shall have the right to solemnize marriage in the Province of Quebec and registers of civil status shall be kept for each congregation of the United Church in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Code and of the Code of Civil Procedure.

In Quebec only.

Statutes of Mortmain not to Apply.

23. The power conferred upon the United Church by the Act of Incorporation or by this Act to acquire by gift, devise or bequest any real or personal property shall not be limited or affected by any Statute or Statutes of Mortmain in force in this Province.

First Meeting of the General Council. 24. All acts or things done by or under the authority of the General Council of the United Church at the first meeting thereof held pursuant to the Act of Incorporation, or any adjournment of such meeting, shall, within this Province, be valid and binding to the extent provided in the Act of Incorporation.

Interim Exercise of Powers. 25. So far as the Legislature of this Province has power to enact, and notwithstanding anything in the Act of Incorporation or in this Act contained, every corporation, board, committee and other body, whether incorporated or unincorporated, created by or under the government or control of or in connection with any of the negotiating churches or any congregation thereof, and every organization, board, committee or governing body of or in connection with any congregation of the negotiating churches, and every officer and member of such congregation, shall continue to have, exercise and enjoy all their respective powers, rights, authorities and privileges in the same manner and to the same extent as if this Act had not been passed, until such time or times as the United Church, by its General Council, or otherwise, shall declare that the said powers, rights, authorities and privileges, or any of them, shall cease or determine or be modified or altered, as set out in such declaration and thereupon such powers, rights, authorities and privileges, or any of them, shall cease or determine or be modified or altered, as set out in such declaration and thereupon such powers, rights, authorities and privileges, or any of them, shall cease or determine or be modified or altered, as the case may be, in accordance with the terms of such declaration or declarations from time to time made.

Resolutions of General Council. 26. All resolutions passed by the General Council shall have the force and effect of by-laws, and no formal by-law shall be required for the purpose of managing the affairs of the United Church.

Copies of Certain Documents to be Evidence. 27. All copies of the Basis of Union and of any by-laws, resolutions, rules or regulations in this Act referred to or of any amendment or alteration thereof published under the direction or authority of the General Council of the United Church, and purporting to be so published, or a copy of any by-law, resolution, rule or regulation of the General Council under the seal of the United Church and signed by the secretary, shall be *prima facie* evidence in all Courts of the contents thereof.

Basis of Union Ratified and Confirmed. 28. So far as the Legislature of this Province has power to enact, the Basis of Union is hereby ratified and confirmed, and in so far as the terms and provisions thereof are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, they shall have the same force and effect as if expressly set out herein.

29. The provisions of the Act of Incorporation shall have full force and effect with respect to any property or civil rights within this Province.

Repeal of Inconsistent Enactments. 30. All Acts and portions of Acts of the Legislature of this Province inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed in so far as may be necessary to give full effect to this Act.

Commencement of Act. 31. This Act shall come into force on the day upon which the Act of Incorporation receives the Royal Assent except as to sections three to eight inclusive, which shall come into force on the day of , 19 .

(*f*) REPORT OF UNION COMMITTEE OF THE METHODIST CHURCH

Your Committee organized, with Rev. W. R. Young, Chairman, and Mr. J. A. M. Patrick, Secretary.

Your Committee has considered the Proposed Acts incorporating the United Church of Canada, with Trusts of Model Deed, as amended by the Joint Committee on Church Union, and by the Joint Committee on Law and Legislation under the authority of the Joint Committee on Church Union, and Report of Counsel on proposed legislation to be presented to the Dominion Parliament and Provincial Legislatures, and reports as follows:—

We recommend that:—

1. The Acts as printed and distributed to Conference be approved, subject to the following changes and additions thereto:

Dominion Act.

(1) Section 7, recommended to be amended by the addition of the following words at the end thereof: "The persons entitled to vote at any meeting of such congregation shall be persons in full membership who are of the age of eighteen (18) years or over."

(2) Section 9, recommended to be amended by inserting after the word "membership", in the fifth line thereof, the following words, "who are of the age of eighteen years or over and . . . . ."

(3) Section 10, sub-section "K", recommended to be struck out, and the following substituted therefor, "K. Any determination, decision, or order made by the Commission may be made a rule, order, or decree of the Exchequer Court or any Superior Court of any Province of Canada, or corresponding Courts of Newfoundland and Bermuda, and shall be enforced in like manner as any rule, order, or decree of such Court. To make such determination, decision, or order a rule, order, or decree of any such Court, the usual practice and procedure of the Court in such matters may be followed, and a copy of any such determination, decision or order, certified under the hand of the Chairman, or Acting Chairman of the Commission, and verified by affidavit or statutory declaration of a witness thereto, shall be sufficient evidence of the due making and validity of any such determination, decision, or order."

Model Deed.

Your Committee recommends that sec. 9 be amended as follows:—

(1) By inserting after the words "resign or" in the ninth line thereof, the words "having been," so that the sentence shall read, "In case any of the said Trustees or any Trustee appointed under this provision shall, during his or her term of office, die, resign or, having been, cease to be a member of the United Church of Canada in full communion."

(2) By inserting in the 19th line thereof, after the words "Sundays on which public worship is held," so that the clause shall read, "at any meeting called by notice from the pulpit during public worship on each of the next preceding Sundays on which public worship is held."

(3) By providing that in case the Congregational Meeting is called for the purpose of removing a Trustee, notice in writing of such meeting shall be given to the members of the Trustee Board by letter duly mailed to their last known address.

(4) By substituting the word "three" for the word "five" in the num-

ber of Trustees, to accord with the minimum number of Trustees provided herein.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION.

Your Committee recommends:—

(*a*) That sec. 9 thereof, sub-sec. "B", shall be amended to conform to the new sub-sec. "K", or sec. 10, of the proposed Dominion Act, with the necessary changes of the names of the Courts.

(*b*) That sec. 21 be amended by striking out the words "the Province of Quebec," in the fourth line thereof, and substituting the words "in this Province", by which the clause shall read, "the property of religious societies, congregations, or institutions in force in this Province".

2. We further recommend that a Committee on Church Union be appointed by this General Conference, to consist of not more than forty members, to act for and on behalf of the Methodist Church, to procure the enactments of the proposed acts of the Parliament of Canada, and of the Legislatures of the Provinces of Canada, and of such other Legislatures of the Colonies and countries outside of Canada as may be necessary to consummate the said Union.

We certify that the foregoing is a correct copy of the recommendations of the General Conference of the Methodist Church, concerning the proposed legislation affecting Church Union.

S. D. CHOWN, *General Superintendent,*
T. ALBERT MOORE, *Secretary.*

October 13th, 1922.

Appendix X.

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND ACT, 1921

CHAPTER 29

AN ACT TO DECLARE THE LAWFULNESS OF CERTAIN ARTICLES DECLARATORY OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND IN MATTERS SPIRITUAL PREPARED WITH THE AUTHORITY OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE CHURCH. [28th July 1921.]

A.D. 1921.

Whereas certain articles declaratory of the constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual have been prepared with the authority of the General Assembly of the Church, with a view to facilitate the union of other Churches with the Church of Scotland, which articles are set out in the Schedule to this Act, and together with any modifications of the said articles or additions thereto made in accordance therewith are hereinafter in this Act referred to as "the Declaratory Articles":

And whereas it is expedient that any doubts as to the lawfulness of the Declaratory Articles should be removed:

Be it therefore enacted by the King's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

Effect of Declaratory Articles.

1. The Declaratory Articles are lawful articles, and the constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual is as therein set forth, and no limitation of the liberty, rights and powers in matters spiritual therein set forth shall be derived from any statute or law affecting the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual at present in force, it being hereby declared that in all questions of construction the Declaratory Articles shall prevail, and that all such statutes and laws shall be construed in conformity therewith and in subordination thereto, and all such statutes and laws in so far as they are inconsistent with the Declaratory Articles are hereby repealed and declared to be of no effect.

Other Churches not to be prejudiced.

2. Nothing contained in this Act or in any other Act affecting the Church of Scotland shall prejudice the recognition of any other Church in Scotland as a Christian Church protected by law in the exercise of its spiritual functions.

Jurisdiction of civil courts.

3. Subject to the recognition of the matters dealt with in the Declaratory Articles as matters spiritual, nothing in this Act contained shall affect or prejudice the jurisdiction of the civil courts in relation to any matter of a civil nature.

Citations and commencement.

4. This Act may be cited as the Church of Scotland Act, 1921, and shall come into operation on such date as His Majesty may fix by Order in Council after the Declaratory Articles shall have been adopted by an Act of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland with the consent of a majority of the Presbyteries of the Church.

SCHEDULE

A.D. 1921.

ARTICLES DECLARATORY OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND IN MATTERS SPIRITUAL.

I. The Church of Scotland is part of the Holy Catholic or Universal Church; worshipping one God, Almighty, all-wise, and all-loving, in the Trinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the same in substance, equal in power and glory; adoring the Father, infinite in Majesty, of whom are all things; confessing our Lord Jesus Christ, the Eternal Son, made very man for our salvation; glorying in His Cross and Resurrection, and owning obedience to Him as the Head over all things to His Church; trusting in the promised renewal and guidance of the Holy Spirit; proclaiming the forgiveness of sins and acceptance with God through faith in Christ, and the gift of Eternal life; and labouring for the advancement of the Kingdom of God throughout the world. The Church of Scotland adheres to the Scottish Reformation; receives the Word of God which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as its supreme rule of faith and life; and avows the fundamental principles of the Catholic faith founded thereupon.

II. The principal subordinate standard of the Church of Scotland is the Westminster Confession of Faith approved by the General Assembly of 1647, containing the sum and substance of the Faith of the Reformed Church. Its government is Presbyterian, and is exercised through Kirk-sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods, and General Assemblies. Its system and principles of worship, orders, and discipline are in accordance with "The Directory for the Public Worship of God," "The Form of Presbyterial Church Government," and "The Form of Process," as these have been or may hereafter be interpreted or modified by Acts of the General Assembly or by consuetude.

III. This Church is in historical continuity with the Church of Scotland which was reformed in 1560, whose liberties were ratified in 1592 and for whose security provision was made in the Treaty of Union of 1707. The continuity and identity of the Church of Scotland are not prejudiced by the adoption of these Articles. As a national Church representative of the Christian Faith of the Scottish people it acknowledges its distinctive call and duty to bring the ordinances of religion to the people in every parish of Scotland through a territorial ministry.

IV. This Church, as part of the Universal Church wherein the Lord Jesus Christ has appointed a government in the hands of Church office-bearers, receives from Him, its Divine King and Head, and from Him alone, the right and power subject to no civil authority to legislate, and to adjudicate finally, in all matters of doctrine, worship, government, and discipline in the Church, including the right to determine all questions concerning membership and office in the Church, the constitution and membership of its Courts, and the mode of election of its office-bearers, and to define the boundaries of the spheres of labour of its ministers and other office-bearers. Recognition by civil authority of the separate and independent government and jurisdiction of this Church in matters spiritual, in whatever manner such recognition be expressed, does not in any way affect the character of this government and jurisdiction as derived from the Divine Head of the Church alone, or give to the civil authority any right of interference with the proceedings or judgments of the Church within the sphere of its spiritual government and jurisdiction.

V. This Church has the inherent right, free from interference by civil authority, but under the safeguards for deliberate action and legislation provided by the Church itself, to frame or adopt its subordinate standards, to declare the sense in which it understands its Confession of Faith, to modify the forms of expression therein, or to formulate other doctrinal statements, and to define the relation thereto of its office-bearers and members, but always in agreement with the Word of God and the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith contained in the said Confession, of which agreement the Church shall be sole judge, and with due regard to liberty of opinion in points which do not enter into the substance of the Faith.

A.D. 1921.

VI. This Church acknowledges the divine appointment and authority of the civil magistrate within his own sphere, and maintains its historic testimony to the duty of the nation acting in its corporate capacity to render homage to God, to acknowledge the Lord Jesus Christ to be King over the nations, to obey His laws, to reverence His ordinances, to honour His Church, and to promote in all appropriate ways the Kingdom of God. The Church and the State owe mutual duties to each other and acting within their respective spheres may signally promote each other's welfare. The Church and the State have the right to determine each for itself all questions concerning the extent and the continuance of their mutual relations in the discharge of these duties and the obligations arising therefrom.

VII. The Church of Scotland, belieivng it to be the will of Christ that His disciples should be all one in the Father and in Him, that the world may believe that the Father has sent Him, recognises the obligation to seek and promote union with other Churches in which it finds the Word to be purely preached, the sacraments administered according to Christ's ordinance, and discipline rightly exercised; and it has the right to unite with any such Church without loss of its identity on terms which this Church finds to be consistent with these Articles.

VIII. The Church has the right to interpret these Articles, and, subject to the safeguards for deliberate action and legislation provided by the Church itself, to modify or add to them; but always consistently with the provisions of the first Article hereof, adherence to which, as interpreted by the Church, is essential to its continuity and corporate life. Any proposal for a modification of or addition to these Articles which may be approved of by the General Assembly shall, before it can be enacted by the Assembly, be transmitted by way of overture to Presbyteries in at least two immediately successive years. If the overture shall receive the approval, with or without suggested amendment, of two-thirds of the whole of the Presbyteries of the Church, the Assembly may revise the overture in the light of any suggestions by Presbyteries, and may transmit the overture when so revised to Presbyteries for their consent. If the overture as transmitted in its final form shall receive the consent of not less than two-thirds of the whole of the Presbyteries of the Church, the General Assembly may, if it deems it expedient, modify or add to these Articles in terms of the said overture. But if the overture as transmitted in its final form shall not receive the requisite consent, the same or a similar proposal shall not be again transmitted for the consent of Presbyteries until an interval of five years after the failure to obtain the requisite consent has been reported to the General Assembly.

IX. Subject to the provisions of the foregoing Articles and the powers of amendment therein contained, the Constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual is hereby anew ratified and confirmed by the Church.

Appendix XI.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY ON CHURCH UNION AND UNITY

The Union Movement in Canada.

1. The Files of the Daily Press.
2. The Files of the Church Periodicals, and Year Books of the negotiating churches, are of vital importance.
3. *Legal.*
   (*a*) An Act to Incorporate the United Church of Canada, (Appendix IX).
   (*b*) Church of Scotland Act, 1921. (Appendix X). This act gave the cue to the Canadian Churches' lawyers in their attempt to overcome legal obstacles to Union.
   (*c*) The Edinburgh Scotsman May 23, 1922, contains information on the Scottish Act, and the minority's opposition.
4. *Books on Canadian Union Movement.*
   (*a*) "The Relations of the Christian Churches". Rev. R. Campbell, D.D., ex-Clerk of the General Assembly, of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, (William Briggs, Toronto, 1913).
   (*b*) "The Way to Union". Professor A. S. Morton, (William Briggs, Toronto, 1912).
   (*c*) "Looking Forward". (A Novel for the Times). Dr. Hugh Pedley, Congregationalist. (William Briggs, Toronto).
5. *Magazine Articles on Canadian Church Union Movement.*
   (*a*) Recent Church Union Movements in Canada, by Principal D. J. Fraser (Presbyterian College, Montreal) in The Harvard Theological Review, July, 1915.
   (*b*) Church Union in Canada From a Presbyterian Standpoint, by S. W. Dyde, Queens Theol. College, Kingston, Ontario. (The Journal of Religion, Univ. of Chicago Press, March 1922).
   (*c*) Church Union in Canada, by Rev. E. Thomas of the Canadian Methodist Church, (American Journal of Theology, July 1919).
   (*d*) Church Union Organic or Federal? by Rev. Dr. J. Keir Fraser, Presbyterian, Galt, Ontario. (The Christian Observer, November 1917).
6. *Presbyterian Literature.*
   In addition to Presbyterian Official Records, Books on Union, and Magazine Articles mentioned above we have:—
   (*a*) Much valuable information against Union, published by the Committee for the Preservation of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, and also by its successor, the Presbyterian Church Association, (Write Secretary Rev. J. W. McNamara, 73 Simcoe St., Toronto).
   (*b*) "Church Union, An Opportunity and a Duty By a Group of Presbyterians," (Murray Printing Company, Toronto, 1915). The Contents of this Booklet are:
      (1) Introduction—Rev. D. M. Ramsay, D.D.
      (2) The Principle of Unity—Prof. T. B. Kilpatrick, D.D.
      (3) Union and Home Missions—Rev. J. A. Clarke, D.D.

  - (4) Union and Foreign Missions—Secretary R. P. MacKay, D.D.
  - (5) Union and Social Service—Rev. D. C. MacGregor, M.A.
  - (6) Union and the Colleges—President Sir Robert Falconer, LL.D., (University of Toronto).
  - (7) The Doctrine of the Basis—Principal C. MacKinnon, D.D., Halifax.
  - (8) The Polity of the Basis—President W. C. Murray, LL.D., Saskatoon.
  - (9) The Ministry in the Basis—Principal Alfred Gandier, D.D., (Knox College, Toronto).

(*c*) A Reply to this booklet "Church Union, An Opportunity and a Duty, etc." by the late Rev. D. D. McLeod, of Barrie.

In the interest of fair play these booklets should be studied together; there is in both booklets a self-evident tinge of bias and extravagance.

(*d*) "Junkerism in the Presbyterian Church," by John Stenhouse, M.A., B.Sc., Edin., M.B., Toronto. Decentralization not Merger is advocated. (Write Dr. Stenhouse, 175 Bloor St. East, Toronto).

(*e*) On Presbyterianism:—

  - (1) What is Presbyterianism? Chas. Hodge, (Pres. Publ. Phila.). Ibid by J. A. Hodge.
  - (2) Presbyterianism by John Macpherson (T. & T. Clarke).
  - (3) Westminster Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms, Directory of Public Worship, Presbyterial Church Government (One Vol. Wm. Blackwood and Sons, Edin.).
  - (4) The Westminster Assembly, A. F. Mitchell, (Pres. Publ. Phila.).
  - (5) A Manual of Church Doctrine, Wotherspoon and Kirkpatrick, (Hodder and Stoughton, Lond.).
  - (6) Presbyterianism in the Colonies, R. G. Balfour, (MacNiven & Wallace, Edin.).
  - (7) History of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, Dr. W. Gregg, (Presbyterian Publ. Co., Toronto).
  - (8) Scottish Church Society Conferences 1920, re The Lambeth Encyclical, (A. Elliott, Edin.).
  - (9) The Presbyterian System, W. H. Roberts, (Pres. Publ. Phil.).
  - (10) Church Reform, Ideals and Principles, Barry, (T. & T. Clarke, Edin.).
  - (11) Rules and Forms of Procedure Presbyterian Church in Canada.
  - (12) The Scottish Church Question, James Barr, (J. Clarke & Co., London).
  - (13) Mair's, Digest of Church Laws, (Wm. Blackwood & Sons).
  - (14) Scottish Theology and Theologians, J. Walker, D.D., (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh).

7. *Methodism*:

  - (1) The Marrow of Methodism, R. D. Shaw, (Epworth Press, London).
  - (2) The Essentials of Methodism—Bishop F. J. McConnell, (Meth. Bk. Concern, N.Y.).
  - (3) Dr. Ryerson; "Story of My Life," (Wm. Briggs, Toronto).
  - (4) The Doctrine and Discipline of The Methodist Church, Canada, (Wm. Briggs, Toronto).
  - (5) Dr. Workman's Introduction to a New History of Methodism.
  - (6) Dr. Tasker's Article "Certainty" in H. E. R. E. Vol. iii.
  - (7) Chas. Wesley's Hymns.

- (8) Reunion and Lambeth—Henry S. Lunn, (Epworth Press, London).
- (9) Ryerson Series, not yet completed, contain essays on Methodism, (Ryerson Press, Toronto).
- (10) American Methodism, T. B. Neely, (Revell).
- (11) Methodism, G. S. Fraser, (M.E. Publ. Nashville).
- (12) Digest of Meth. Doc., Prin. W. I. Shaw, (Meth. Book Room, Toronto).
- (13) Wesley's Doctrinal Standards, N. Burwash, The Sermons, (Wm. Briggs, Toronto).

8. *British Methodism and Union.*
   - (1) Thoughts on Unity, Re-union, Uniformity, by G., (Epworth Press, London).
   - (2) Methodist Union, (Ibid).
   - (3) Christian Union and Methodist Fusion, J. E. Rattenbury, (Ibid).
   - (4) British Methodism, As it Is, Was, Will be, Rev. Geo. Eayrs, (The Magnet Press, London).
   - (5) Sir Robert W. Perk's Address, Methodist Recorder, Nov. 10, 1922.

9. *Congregationalism.*
   - (*a*) Books:
     - (1) Congregationalism, by Williston Walker in the American History Series.
     - (2) Congregational Manual and Rules of Order, by W. E. Barton, D.D., (Pilgrim Press, Chicago).
     - (3) Congregational Administration, by Charles Sumner Nash, (Pilgrim Press, Boston).
     - (4) The Congregational Way, by George M. Boynton, (Pilgrim Press, New York).
     - (5) A Statement of Faith, by Dr. Herring, (Pilgrim Press).
     - (6) Williston Walker's, Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism, N.Y., 1893, is comprehensive and trustworthy.
     - (7) In Schaff, Walker, and the Article "Congregationalists" in the new Schaff-Herzog Encyl., a full statement of relative literature may be found.
     - (8) Congregationalism and Reunion—P. T. Forsyth, (Congregational Union, London).
     - (9) Reunion and Recognition, (Ibid).
   - (*b*) *Booklets:*
     - (1) The Place of Congregationalism in Recent History, H. C. Herring, (Pilgrim Press).
     - (2) Matters Congregational, (National Council, Pilgrim Press).
     - (3) Congregational Forms, (Ibid).

10. *Anglican Literature:*
    - (*a*) Relative to Church Union in Canada:
      - (1) See important list given at close of section on The Anglican Position on Union, (Chapter I. C.).
      - (2) Pamphlet on Co-operation in Theological Training, Montreal Diocesan Theol. College.
    - (b) Anglican Books of Importance on Church Reunion:
      - (1) The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion, A. C. Headlam, D.D., Oxford, (John Murray, London).
      - (2) Passing Protestantism and coming Catholicism, Smyth, (Scribners).
      - (3) Godly Union and Concord—Henson, (Longmans & Co.).
      - (4) Restatement and Reunion—Streeter, (MacMillan).
      - (5) Church Divisions and Christianity—W. Leighton Crane, (MacMillan).

(6) The Free Churches and Re-Union, T. R. Glover, (Heffer & Sons, Cambridge, England).
(7) The Churches at the Cross Roads, Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, M.A., (London: Williams and Norgate).

11. *Baptist Literature:*
  (*a*) Canadian Booklets:—
    (1) "The Baptist Message," by Rev. Dr. T. T. Shields.
    (2) "Baptist and Christian Union," by A. L. McCrimmon, M.A., LL.D., Ex-chancellor of McMaster University, Toronto.
    (3) Dr. McCrimmon has also written on "Baptists and Denominationalism," and
    (4) "The Baptist Message." These four booklets are published by the Baptist Church House, 233 Church St., Toronto.
  (*b*) Baptist Articles:
    (1) "The Union Movement," by Geo. Cross, Ph.D., formerly Professor at McMaster University, Toronto, (The Canadian Baptist, Sept. 29, 1904).
    (2) "Demands of Baptists," (Ibid, Jan. 19, 1905).
    (3) "A visible Church and Christian Unity," by Dean Shailer Mathews, University of Chicago, in The Constructive Quarterly, March 1922.
  (*c*) Baptist Booklets:—
    (1) The Annual Report of the Home Mission Council of Montana, by Secretary Rev. G. C. Cress Lewiston, Montana, 1919.
    (2) The Montana Plan of Every—Community Service (Ibid) 1920. This report deserves special study as it shows that co-operation may be successfully carried out without Organic Union.
    (3) Christian Co-operation in Montana, Past and Present Achievements, etc. No. 7. (Home Mission Council, 156 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., 1921).
  (*d*) Books on Baptist Doctrine and Polity:—
    (1) The Star Book on Baptist Church Polity, E. T. Hiscox, D.D.
    (2) The Unfolding of Baptist Doctrine, Norman Fox, D.D.

12. *Miscellaneous Literature of Importance.*
  1. The Federal Council of the Churches (U.S.A.) 105 East 22nd Street, New York, has published many excellent books and pamphlets on other plans than Organic Union for the visible expression of Spiritual Unity.
  2. Much printed matter on The Commission on World Conference on Christian Faith and Order, may be secured from the Commission, Gardiner, Maine, U. S. A.
  3. The Proposed Credal Basis of Christian Reunion, C. J. Cadoux, (Chicago Journal of Religion, Nov. 1921).
  4. The Christian Century has published various articles on Union (1921-2) from denominational viewpoints.
  5. The Expository Times and British Weekly. Various articles.
  6. The Church Unity Quarterly, (Baltimore).
  7. Books:—
    (*a*) Religion and Business, R. W. Babson, (MacMillan).
    (*b*) Evangelical Christianity, its History and Witness, edited by W. B. Selbie, (Hodder & Stoughton).
    (*c*) Christian Unity, its Principles and Possibilities, Briggs, (Association Press, 347 Madison Ave., New York, 1921). In the Appendix there is a 12 page "Selected Bibliography on Present Movements toward Christian Unity."
    (*d*) Source Book and Bibliographical Guide for American Church History, by Peter G. Mode, Ph.D., of the University of Chi-

cago, (Banta, Wisconsin, 1921). It contains a Bibliography on Church Union.

(*e*) The Aberdeen Doctors, (Chapt. VI), Dr. D. MacMillan, (Hodder & Stoughton).

8. Community Programs for Co-operating Churches, R. B. Guild, Editor, (Association Press, N.Y.).

13. *Theology.*
    (1) Standard Works on Church History, Doctrine, and Polity.
    (2) Relative articles in Encyclopedias, Especially Encyl. of Religion and Ethics.
    (3) Schaff; and Curtis, on Creeds and Confessions.
    (4) Denominational Books.
    (5) Books on the Modern Social Gospel, and on Modern Science in relation to Religion, should be studied particularly by Canadians, since this phase of Theology is almost entirely neglected in the Basis of Union. The Social Programs and declarations of the Churches in Canada and the United States are worthy of attention.

Addendum

Addendum I.

A BRIEF COMMENTARY ON THE TWENTY ARTICLES OF DOCTRINE.

The text of the Basis of Union is found in Appendix V. See also Chapter III. A.

THE PREAMBLE.

The Introductory Paragraph states the aim and purport of the following Sections. They are not intended to be a compilation of all the teachings of Scripture; nor a statement of all that Christian people, in view of Scripture and experience, feel themselves warranted to hold; nor a system, more or less complete, of Christian Theology. They are intended to contain "a brief summary" of the Christian faith, as it is commonly held by Methodists, Congregationalists and Presbyterians.

They endeavour to express that "substance" or essence or central significance, of Christianity, which constitute it the supreme redemptive religion in the world. They attempt to present the contents of saving faith, as that is exercised within the three churches. "Let it be a testimony of the faith which we find to be living and working in us in manifold forms, even without logical and reflective consistency, and we liberate religious life from the bonds of theological dogma. The very freedom with which parallel statements are accepted as of equal value in history, without any effort to reconcile them in one philosophical statement, bears testimony to the practical spirit which was supreme in spite of the earnest desire of the older members to make sure that there be no break with the continuous tradition of the church." (E. Thomas, *The American Journal of Theology,* July, 1919).

"It is further to be noted that this aim could not be carried out, as it were, in an historical void. The Church of Christ has existed for 2,000 years; and, once and again, in its history it has been constrained to express its conception of Christianity in some shorter and simpler, or longer and more elaborate form of words. The three churches, accordingly, were bound to take these into consideration, and to relate their own endeavour to those which had been made at previous epochs of church history.

In the first place, they clearly indicate to what the supreme loyalty is due, viz.—

(*a*) to the Gospel of Divine grace itself, "the foundation" laid by the work of prophets and apostles, called and inspired of God to proclaim and interpret His message;

(*b*) to the Scriptures, in which God has declared His saving purpose, and through which He is still uttering His voice to the church, which are therefore "the primary source," whence Christians derive "their faith and life," and the "ultimate standard," by which all Christian professions and plans must be tested.

"In the second place they show how subject to this supreme loyalty, they accept the three great creeds of the ancient church—the Apostles', the Nicene, and the symbol of Chalcedon, in their affirmation of the historic reality of Christ, of His true Divinity, and of His Humanity and Divinity together. Further, we maintain our allegiance to the evangelical doctrines of the "Reformation," principally that is, the Evangelical Faith, as over against the Sacerdotalism of Rome.

"The Reformation was, in essence, a revival of evangelical religion. Before the Reformation period, had passed away, however, the analytic intellect of philosophers and theologians had begun to operate upon the Christian experience of Salvation, and to separate out the various elements distinguishable in it. As a result, in the immediately succeeding century, the 17th, this process was carried to lamentable extremities, and the Protestant world was seamed with divisions of opinion upon doctrinal points, which involved endless debates regarding psychological and metaphysical questions. One profoundly mysterious question had to do with the part played by God and man in Salvation. Thus the Divine Sovereignty and human freedom confronted one another, and made as it were the rallying points for two contrasted theories. These theories became embodied in creeds and confessions, some following the Calvinistic and some the Arminian type. The lapse of time has taken us away from these controversies. We have learned the dangers of applying an analytic logic to the fulness of life.

"The three churches, accordingly pronounce no judgment upon Calvinism and Arminianism as systems. They neither accept one or other, or attempt a hybrid system out of them both. But they assert as need arises, the truth that belongs to each, without seeking meticulous accuracy of statement, and happily regardless of analytic intellectual processes." "Logic ceases to divide those who are experimentally at one."

These quotations from one of our Theologians* show a well meant desire to avoid controversy, but I think the parallelism of antiquated and incoherent doctrines in the interest of comprehensiveness does not get us anywhere. How can you make irreconcilable doctrines the Basis of a creed that will be expressive of the living faith and intelligent mind of the twentieth century? It appears to me that however well meant the preamble may have been, the Articles that follow it are so illogical both as to parallelism and order, and the phraseology itself is so old-fashioned, that the claim made, to the effect that in this new Basis of Doctrine "the dead hand of the Seventeenth century will no longer lay its paralysing might upon those churches of the twentieth century, as they join ranks, and set forth as one body, to evangelize the world," is largely an illusion. Why, even in heathen lands, the old Theology is fast losing its grip on the educated "heathen," and the modern interpretation of Christianity, is forging ahead. It is a pity that we have not, here, for the proposed new church a fresh creed, instead of one largely framed upon the Basis of two brief Presbyterian statements of faith, which though modified somewhat are still in the class of Theologies of other days, and not expressive of the living faith of the educated rising generation.

---

*This Theologian, whose words I have incorporated extensively in this Addendum asked me not to use his name. I am, therefore, unable to name one, to whom I am much indebted for help in this section of the book.

Two other criticisms of the preamble must suffice: the first is from an orthodox minister, the second is merely a critical remark by a modern scholar:

(1) The late Rev. D. D. McLeod, D.D., of Barrie, replying to Principal MacKinnon, wrote:

"The Principal quotes the remark that this is no age in which to construct a creed. Sharp, clear-cut credal expressions are therefore not to be expected, nor is this the aim of the doctrinal statement in the basis." In the preamble of the Basis, it is said "we acknowledge the teaching of the great creeds of the Ancient Church"—granting this, the question is, do we require a new creed? We have in our present creed all that we have in the basis and more. Are we called on to cast it aside? The reason for doing so is because the Methodist and Congregational churches will not accept it. We therefore lay it aside to please them, and also detach our church from the Creed she has hitherto held, and so bring our church to an end. The point to be proved is that we should make this disavowal of our Creed for the sake of Union. This has not been proved. We think this sacrifice should not be asked of us—nor made by us. Neither Methodist nor Congregationalist abandon their creeds, but we, to satisfy them abandon ours.

"It may be that we are easily content with vague and elastic phrases," as the Principal says. "That spirit is not altogether to be admired. We owe the best we have in our civil and religious life to men who had a clear-cut conception of what they believed and who believed that it was their duty to stand by what they believed. The Presbyterian Church has been built up by such men in its pulpits and in its pews. The Principal gives no reason why we should discard our standards for the Basis, or why we should abandon our church."

(2) A well-known minister declares: *"The use of language in the Basis is very loose.* It would be intolerable and impossible to the giant creed makers of old. For example, in the Preamble we read, 'We affirm our belief in the Scriptures........ as the primary source and ultimate standard of Christian faith and life.' This, of course, is impossible. The most we can say is that the Scriptures are a guide to Christian life."

ARTICLE I. OF GOD.

"The Westminster Confession of Faith begins with a chapter on Holy Scripture. So did the Helvetic Confessions in the Sixteenth century, and for the obvious reason that those documents were manifestoes of doctrine designed to obviate mistake and defeat calummy. Therefore they put first the source from which their materials were derived, and the authority on which they rested; viz., Holy Writ, and not the decrees of popes or the traditions of Christendom. But the ancient creeds and the majority of the Reformed Confessions begin with a declaration of faith in God. Evidently this is the natural order. It would be a strange thing to say 'I believe in the Book of God' before saying 'I believe in God.' Let us begin with the more fundamental proposition. We believe in a Supreme Intelligence, Supreme Affection, Supreme Justice, Supreme Will. At the apex of being, at the source of life and force, at the centre of universal order is God. Good has a best, strength a stronger, and righteousness One who is inflexibly just. Without this faith the order of the world is a riddle, and the mystery of life a crushing burden to the mind. The supremacy of unthinking, unconscious force, the origination and regulation of the universe without any intelligent design, we can never accept. The thing is unthinkable. And we follow alike the best intuitions of the soul and the strongest presumption of our reason when we believe in God, and thirst for God." (Rev. Donald Fraser, D.D., *Sound Doctrine, A Commentary on The Articles of the Faith of the Presbyterian Church of England,* London, 1892).

"In the short Saxon word God—a word of uncertain origin—we utter the greatest conception that has reached the human soul. It is that of a Being Who is the very Fountain of Life.... Statements descriptive of Him, however choice and correct the language, must be inadequate to their sublime and really ineffable theme. Let us begin with this acknowledgment, and bow in adoration before Him Whom no eye of mortal sees, and no mind of mortal man can penetrate." (Dr. Fraser's *Commentary*).

The Statement in the Basis of Union is a reflection of the Westminster formulation which is philosophical rather than distinctly Christian in character, e.g., "Infinite, Eternal and Unchangeable in His Being and Perfection." On the Christian view all the attributes of Godhead in their expression and activity are determined by Father-love which is their central essence of Godhead—in the old way of putting it, Father-love is the absolute attribute of God in the Christian Revelation, all others are relative and theoretically are determined in their exercise and expression relatively to the ends of Father-love which is the central essence. This properly Christian perspective is not sufficiently brought out in the Statement—*Article* I.

Following the line of the Westminster Confession the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is added to Article I of the Basis, but abbreviated. It seems to me that the order of the U. F. Church statement 1921 (See Appendix VII) is more logically arranged and better also in that it gives a separate article to the Trinity.

"Chapter II. (Westminster Confession) 'Of God and the Holy Trinity', is entirely in accord with the Nicene Faith; only its feeble statement of the doctrine of the Trinity in Section 3, was altogether inadequate to resist the Unitarianism, which came like a flood early in the Eighteenth century and eventually captured the entire Presbyterian Church in England." (C. A. Briggs *Theological Symbolics*).

A Presbyterian Professor writes (in a fragmentary note book): That Article I. affirms the Unity, Personality, and Tri-unity of God. Of the latter he says:

"The fee of faith is the logic of the mere understanding, with its persistent tendency to think in terms of number and of space. To such a logic, the Unity of God is an absolutely clear, and perfectly rigid idea. It is such Unity as belongs to an Individual Thing, Substance or Idea;

a Unity which excludes, all other things, Substances, or Ideas, and is wholly self-centred and impervious. To say that God is a Unity therefore is to say that He is a Monad, a closed circle, an abstract identity, admitting in Himself of no differentiation or manifoldness. Christian faith does not move in so rarified an atmosphere as this; and does not approach its problems with an *a priori* philosophy, to which it must fit its facts........ It has an experience; and if logic cannot comprehend the experience, so much the worse for logic!"

"The mystery of the Holy Trinity" (*Art.* I.). A Holy Trinity is a mystery in every sense of the word. It is such in the popular import of the term, as transcending our powers of thought; and it is such in the sense which mystery has in the New Testament, as a religious truth of the first order, which was hidden from former generations, but is now divinely disclosed." "To acknowledge this mystery, we feel to be the proper attitude of mind toward this truth. We do not analyse or dissect it with the instruments of logic; nor do we wrap it round with our poor explanation or defence."

"All questions concerning the Holy Trinity and the Divine-human Person of our Lord were keenly sifted and resolutely determined and settled by Greek Theologians and General Councils, in the earlier centuries of our era. We do not receive their deliverances and definitions as infallible, but we are satisfied that they truly set forth the teaching of Holy Scripture. We do not repeat the creed which has been erroneously ascribed to St. Athanasius; but the doctrine which Athanasius vindicated against Arius, and which the church has never departed from either in the East or the West, is that which we acknowledge and maintain."

"The Jew, the Gentile Deist, and the Moslem, all say: 'God is one, and there is no other but He.' So say we too. But, as Christians, we are taken near to the divine secret, and drink of deep wells of salvation, in that we are taught to recognize in the one God not a mere unicity, but the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit:—the Father Who has loved us, the Son Who has redeemed us, and the Holy Spirit Who regenerates and comforts us. To Whom be glory everlasting!" (Dr. Fraser's *Commentary*).

"To multiply material types of the Trinity is in no way to make its immaterial metaphysical existence evident as a spiritual fact, and therefore does not, I think, offer any assistance towards conceiving the mystery accepted by most Christians under that name." (Anne Kemble —*"Further Records of France,* Vol. I. 1890, p. 173).

I have no particular love for the credal statement of the doctrine of the Trinity, but I feel convinced that the power of Christ, in human life, as God under the nomenclature of spirit of God is the significant thing. When men hold this mighty spiritual truth vaguely and loosely, they become unsound on ever so many other points, and, as to personal religion, often become lukewarm and self-righteous.

Of Articles I. *and* XIV. Principal Fraser acutely remarks, "The statement places in the forefront the doctrine of the Trinity. We worship Him in the unity of the Godhead and the mystery of the Holy Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, three persons, of the same substance, equal in power and glory." (See Art. I.). The United Church, then, according to A. V. G. Allen in his Christian Institutions (page 327), will be a branch of the "catholic" church in the authoritative sense of the term. "According to this decree (of 380 A.D.) the Nicene Doctrine of the co-equality of Father, Son and Holy Ghost is declared to be the Catholic Faith. Those who accept this faith are alone to enjoy the privilege of being known as Catholics........ Efforts to appropriate this renowned historical designation in the interests of some restricted view of the church, whether of its usage or its organization, whether in ancient days or in our own, have no value and certainly no prestige compared with the definition which gave a new foundation for Christian society." Like the reformers, then, of the Sixteenth century, the compilers of this Basis, not necessarily with a conscious intention, have preserved the ancient technical charter of catholicity.

"The Catholicity of the United Church, in the popular sense of the term, must be judged by *Article* XIV: 'We acknowledge as a part, more or less pure, of this universal brotherhood, every particular church throughout the world which professes faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him as Divine Lord and Saviour.'"

A Presbyterian Professor of Systematic Theology writes: "The statement of *the Trinity in the Basis* (*Article* I.) is an example of *antiquated and erroneous* statements drawn from the older creeds—statements that are no longer intelligible or acceptable to the modern mind," and adds "The ministers of our city proposed certain restatements on several doctrinal points. These were sent on to Toronto but turned down. The excuse given was that the framers of the Basis, while admitting it was not an up-to-date creed, maintained that they had no intention of forming a creed, but only of harmonizing the existing creeds of the three churches with tactful omissions and compromise."

Miscellaneous Notes on Article I.

(a) It begins with "We believe in the one only living and true God." The Creed called "The Apostles" has "I believe in God"; the Nicene Creed, "I believe in one God." Both the Thirty-nine Articles and the Westminster Confession have exactly the same statement, "There is but one living and true God."

That we believe in God is meant to exclude Atheism. That we believe in one living and true God is aimed against Polytheism and Pantheism. That we believe in God Who is a Spirit implies that God is One, who may be known, with whom communication is possible, who can be approached in a spirit of sincere reverence, a God to Whom man can speak, who speaks to man, and entertains for him, and works out in his behalf, the design of His love "in opposition to those who deify objects in nature or who embody their conceptions of gods in carved or graven images." (Dr. Fraser's *Commentary*).

It is therefore implied that the Spirit in Whom we believe, and with whom we may have fellowship and even friendship has personal consciousness, disposition, purpose and will. With a non-personal God we can have no relations whatever.

Dr. Donald Fraser says "Not a Spirit (as in the Basis of Union and the Shorter Catechism)* but spirit, essential, fontal, original and originating, and not flesh, not limited by material conditions or by bodily parts and organs."

Had the compilers of the Basis followed the English Article in dropping "a" before Spirit, the attempt at definition would have been less anthropomorphic.

---

*Bracketed words mine.

(b) Love—"The Westminster Confession describes God as "most loving." The Shorter Catechism is content with the word "goodness", following the Old Testament—"Abundant in goodness." "O give thanks to God, for He is good." But it has often been pointed out as a defect in the Catechism, that it answers the question, What is God? without even an allusion to the great New Testament saying, that "God is love." This is the very crown of His perfection even as in man "love is the bond of perfection." And this is the comfort of faith, that all the Divine decrees, decisions, and dealings with men, while guided by wisdom, ordered in righteousness and regulated in truth, issue from and are suffused with a transcendant love." (Dr. Donald Fraser's *Commentary*).

Article I. of the Basis, has the merit of making its ruling idea the brief absolute definition that "God is Love." Those who drew up the Basis have not fully followed out the implications of this praiseworthy conception. Round this distinctive message of Christianity, and this central character of God, are grouped all the qualities we can discern in God. No complete list of these is possible. The Article in the Basis, merely indicates at random, those features of the Divine Love, with which believing man has to do. Hence some familiar, natural, and moral attributes are set forth, in a topsy turvey fashion, viz., (1) Omnipotence, (2) Righteousness, (3) Holiness, (4) Wisdom, (5) Mercy and Compassion, (6) Goodness and Truth.

(c) There is a distinction between a creed and a didactic statement of doctrine.

It is specially important under this first Article that we do not say "there is" or even "we believe that there is one living and true God;" but "we believe in (the) one living and true God, who is Spirit," etc. We do more than affirm the fact of His existence; we confide in Him for life and peace, and we testify to what we have found Him to be." (Dr. Donald Fraser's *Commentary*).

ARTICLES II., V., XII., AND XIV.

These Articles, "Of Revelation," "Of the Sin of Man," "Of Sanctification," "Of the Law of God," are cited by a Methodist Professor of Systematic Theology, as illustrations of the efforts put forth, by the makers of the Basis, to preserve something of the creeds of the Presbyterian and Methodist churches. Insistence on this, he claims, promotes diversity and injures rather than helps the spiritual life.

ARTICLE II. OF REVELATION.

This Article is taken from the Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith (U.S.A.) with slight changes, perhaps the most important change is that in reference to the Scriptures where they are described "as the Word of God." This is changed to "as containing the word of God."

The last sentence of this Article is an inadequate description of God's revelation through the Scriptures. There should be a separate Article on the Holy Scriptures, and it should be of such a kind as to command the respect of modern scholarship relative to the evolutionary character of Biblical Revelation. The emphasis in such an additional article should stress The Word as a wonderful means of Grace. (See Chapter IV).

"Chapter I. in the Westminster Confession, 'Of the Holy Scripture' is admirable; by far the best symbolic statement; one which in no particular stands in the way of Biblical criticism. It does not follow the Helvetic Concensus in its insistence on verbal inspiration and the originality of the Hebrew vowel points. The opinion of some scholastic divines, who, compelled to abandon the inerrancy of the Hebrew and Greek texts, urge the inerrancy of a supposed original text, finds no representation." (Briggs, *Theological Symbolics*).

"In this Article on Revelation, the great epochs in God's revelation of Himself are broadly marked:—

(*a*) *Nature,* whose inarticulate utterances in gentleness and loneliness, and wisdom, or in majesty and awfulness of judgment, man learns to interpret as the very voice of God.

(*b*) *History,* which is a mighty lesson book in which man learns much of the inexorableness of justice, and something of the Divine long suffering.

(*c*) *The Heart of Man,* in whose unappeasable longing, and agelong quest, God is speaking of Himself, and striving with His willing and unwilling children to bring them to Our Father.

(*d*) Nearer yet He came, and more plainly yet He spoke, by the lips of *prophetic* men, who learned from *His own Spirit* what they should proclaim regarding him.

(*e*) At last, God, after having spoken "at sundry times and in divers manners" by the prophets, spoke by His *Son,* Jesus the Christ, the Word of God, the brightness of the Father's glory, the express image of His Person.

(*f*) In the *Scriptures* He speaks still. They are not mere literature, printed and dead. They contain His living and abiding Word. Inspired by His Spirit, they direct us in faith; they command us in duty. Not indeed that they constitute a code, to be interpreted legally and casuistically. Their meaning is Christ, and the redemption wrought by Him. Their great function is to make Him known, and to evoke faith in Him, and for that, without intervention of tradition, they are, through the *Spirit's witness,* efficient and sufficient." (A Canadian Theologian).

"Up to the time of the Reformation the only kind of theological study which was thought worthy of serious attention was the study of dogma. People's daily spiritual life was supposed to be nourished, not by Scripture, but by the Sacraments. The experimental use of Scripture, so dear to Protestants, was not recognized as one of the main purposes for which God has given us the Bible. The use of the Bible was to furnish proof texts for the theologians of the church, and the doctrines of the church as expressed in the Creeds were the necessary and sufficient objects of faith. The believer had indeed need of Christ as well as of a creed, but Christ was held forth to him, not in the Bible, but in the Mass. The Bible was the source of theological knowledge as to the mysterious doctrine of revelation, but the Sacraments were the means of grace.

"The reformation changed all this, and brought the Bible to the front as a living means of grace. How did it do so? Not, as is sometimes superficially imagined, by placing the infallible Bible in room of the infallible church, but by a change in the whole conception of faith, of the plan and purpose of revelation, and of the operation of the means of grace." (See *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church,* Chapter I; W. Robertson Smith). Lindsay in his *History of the Reformation,* Vol. I. Chapter VIII, (4), expresses the same view as W. Robertson Smith. Lindsay's section on the Holy Scriptures is a classic.

In other words, the Bible is not presented as an Infallible substitute for the Infallible Church of Pre-reformation times, but it is said to contain the word of God—not to be the word of God, which is neither Catholic nor Presbyterian—as a wonderful means of Grace. That is the Reformation rehabilitated the word as a means of Grace and thus we have the Word, the Sacraments, and Prayer as the supply house of grace through the operation of the Spirit of God. (cf. The *Shorter Catechism*). All our teaching and worship depend on the Bible as a wonderful means of grace. It contains the Word in that sense, and is not the Word in the narrow sense of being the source of proof texts to justify any individual's notions. All sorts of foolish teachings may be advocated by ignorance of sound Biblical exegesis. Not only so, but "it is by no means impossible to express in language which is entirely scriptural systems of doctrine widely divergent from each other, yet all of them alien to that truth which created and has sustained the church. Most heresies have professed to argue from Scripture. But the authority possessed by a collection of extracts from Scripture is not the authority of Scripture, but only such as may be attached to the theological competency; religious judgment, and personal tendencies of the individual who determines the selection. The Catholic Creeds furnish the church with a safeguard, and give the Christian a protection against attempts of the kind. In them we see the church fulfilling two of its essential functions—in the Apostles' Creed providing for the instruction and teaching of candidates for her membership: in the Nicene, for the rejection of false additions to the truth, and of erroneous explanations of the mysteries of the Faith," (See *A Manual of Church Doctrine,* Wotherspoon and Kirkpatrick, Hodder and Stoughton).

On the other hand "the view that the church possesses an adequate statement of fundamental doctrines in the Nicene Creed fails to take account of the fact that this Creed deals with only one of the three main heads of the Christian religion, and while the Apostles' Creed is more comprehensive, it errs by excess in including such articles as the Descensus ad Inferos, and it errs still more by defect in that it throws no light upon the conditions of salvation, and lays no emphasis on the duty of following Christ and of advancing His Kingdom.

"An enumeration of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity must include (a) a list of the blessings of the Christian religion; (b) the Christian doctrine of God—revealed as Father. Son, and Holy Ghost; and (c) a statement of the gracious conditions on which man enjoys forgiveness and has the promise of eternal life, and of the consequent aspirations and obligations of the Christian calling," (*The Rule of Faith*, W. P. Paterson, p. 428).

It is important to note that the rehabilitation of the Word as a wonderful means of grace obscured the Sacraments, but I believe that the modern larger conception of Scripture and Creeds will eventually restore sacraments to a more prominent place as a means of grace than they now have, whilst not giving up in any sense the rehabilitated blessing of Scripture as equally important for the same purpose.

The compilers of the Basis in their questions to be put to ministers at Ordination have made the blunder of asking subscription to Scripture instead of to the living mind, of the church. There is therefore no credal subscription, nor even a creed to which to subscribe in the basis of union. (See Chapter III, C).

ARTICLE III.

"Article III. takes up the implications of Article I. by adding that we know:—

The Supremacy of God: The love of God is not an idea, conception, or notion operative in what we might term a still, or static universe, as we might imagine, by a kind of social power, achieving its results coldly inevitably. Nor is it a sentiment acting impulsively, occasionally, casually.

The God of the Bible is neither pure intellect, nor mere emotion. The love of God is essentially will, and the very essence of the Divine nature, conceived not as substance or as force, but as personality, a Being who acts in intention, with an end in view which He sets Himself to reach, employing in the effort all the resources at His disposal. The end in view is not explicitly designated in the Basis till the last section, and the final phrases. There it is described as the kingdom of God.

This great word and thought, which was continually in the heart and on the lips of Jesus, means, not so much the realm over which God rules, as the sovereign sway of God, and summarizes in one pregnant phrase, both the end of all the Divine activities, and the state which humanity and the world will reach, when the sovereignty of God is acknowledged with surrender and worship and praise.

It is in this sense, that supremacy is attributed to God and to His purpose, through the Scripture, and is humbly and rejoicingly acknowledged in Christian faith; and it is this supremacy of God, as the God of love, that is confessed in the phrases of Article III. It is not sovereignty, as it were, in *vacuo*, it is the sovereignty of love, holy, wise, everlasting, and faith does not yield to it as a crushing fate, but glories in it as the royal attribute of redeeming grace." (Presbyterian Professor).

Three aspects of the Sovereign action of Divine Love are noted in the Article by this Presbyterian Professor:

(1) *Its universal range and scope.* It "embraces all events."

"This statement is not made by constraint of logic, which presents the world in the rigidity of a syllogism, nor by consent of empiricism which makes a perilous induction from particulars. It is made by experience of the Divine Love, in its overcoming might, as manifest in the work of Christ. God in Christ has reconciled the world to Himself. Love has met the worst that sin can do. God reigns; love reigns. Not the smallest thing is too slight for its care; "are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And one of them shall not fall to the ground without your Father? Not the most terrible is beyond its transmuting power, which makes even the wrath of God to praise Him. The system of the universe is instinct with love. All's law, indeed; but all's love in the acceptance of faith, and by the proof of life."

(2) *The Condition under which it operates.* "Here we touch on a great mystery, which is not meant to brow-beat our intellects; but to evoke our praise. The sovereignty of bare power is easy to imagine and evokes no wonder, for a mere stupefaction of mind does not glorify God. We are called upon to admire in the world, not power manipulating a passive material; but Divine love working under conditions of human freedom. God has set Himself a problem, speaking reverently, for which no human logic provides the solution:—how to combine His sovereignty and man's independence. Logic is quite competent to create a system from either side of the contract, and the systems thus created are as false as they are logically consistent. The solution lies in love itself. The Divine love is not without its human analogue; and the wisest earthly love is sparing in force. It dares to allow freedom to the beloved.

"So, the everlasting love! It has dared to allow man his freedom. It has risked his sinning. The bare thought that God has intended man to sin is blasphemy of His holy love. It is true none the less that human freedom, with the possibility of man's sinning, is the condition under which God's love operates, and in this condition there is seen, more than in coercion, the glory of wise and almighty love.

(3) *The Certainty of its Triumph.* "This statement, as the above in reference to the universal range and scope of the Divine purpose is made from the standpoint of the cross. I venture to think that this should have been made more plain in this Article, which, as far as the phrasing goes, might seem to isolate providence from redemption.

"Providence and Redemption are stages or aspects of one historic movement which centres in the cross, i.e., in the victory of dying and undying love.

"In the Cross of Christ I glory
  Towering o'er the wrecks of Time;
All the light of Sacred Story
  Gathers round its head sublime."

"This is "the fulfillment of His sovereign design, and the manifestation of His glory." Christian faith, standing by the cross, interprets all history as the movement of love; overcoming hate, and subduing all things under itself, and looks beyond and above the flux of time, and the opposition of conflicting wills, to that of victory of love sealed and guaranteed in the deed of Calvary.

"This is no easy faith, but at least we are not to burden ourselves with impossibilities, and attempt to say of every detail "this was eternally decreed." But we are entitled to say that, even in a world which, in one aspect, is a world of law, and, in another, is a world of freedom, God reigns, and is achieving, under conditions which seem impossible, the victory of His love."

ARTICLES III. AND VI.

These Articles, "Of the Divine Purpose," and "Of the Grace of God," respectively, involve the vexed problem of determinism and free will.

Principal Clarence MacKinnon, Pine Hill College, Halifax, in a published article on the basis of union, writes: "Even the formidable disputes between Calvinist and Arminian that once surged around the sovereignty and purpose of God, are, we may hope, forever laid to rest in the happy confession of this basis." To prove his point he quotes in full Article III. Of the Divine Purpose.

The writer prefers, however, to accept the statement of the learned Principal of another Presbyterian College, as more accurate, viz.,—"The traditional difference between the Presbyterian and Methodist churches on the problem of determinism and free will has always been one largely of emphasis. The metaphysical dispute has practically disappeared from modern religious discussion, and from the pulpits of both churches is preached on occasion the scriptural doctrine of election as a missionary vocation, an election not to privilege but to service, not to be exclusively saved but to save others. The Calvinistic bold doctrine of absolute predestination and the Arminian doctrine of foreordination based on foreknowledge find no place in this proposed Basis, and *Article VI,* "Of the Grace of God," leaves a member still to grapple with the everlasting philosophical antimony: "We believe that God in His own good pleasure gave His Son a people, an innumerable multitude chosen in Christ unto holiness, service, and salvation."

Or *Article III*: "We believe that the eternal, wise, holy, and loving purpose of God embraces all events, so that while the freedom of man is not taken away nor is God the author of sin, yet in His providence He makes all things work together in the fulfillment of His sovereign design and the manifestation of His glory."

The writer of the Thesis while appreciative of the well meant use of the U.S.A. Brief Statement, feels, however, that the wording of these articles reveals that the compilers had the old dispute in the background of their minds. Ingenious attempts to explain the reconciliation of Arminianism and Calvinism in this way after all are superficial. I have attempted (above) to make the most of Article III. with a view to religious utility, and yet I am compelled to agree with C. A. Briggs (*Theological Symbolics*) when he says of the Westminster Confession: "Chapter III. of God's Eternal Decree; IV. Of Creation; V. Of Providence; VI. Of the Fall of Man, of Sin, and of the Punishment thereof; VII. Of God's Covenant with Man; IX. Of Free Will; X. Of Effectual

Calling, all take the High Calvinistic position of the Synod of Dort over against Arminianism; and no kind of revision can change them into an admission either of Arminianism or of the moderate Augustinianism of the Roman Catholic Church, of the Lutheran Church, of the Articles of Religion of the Church of England (and the Methodists Articles in so far as they are derived from these), or of Modern Thought. They are excessive in their elaborate statements, and rigid and polemic in their doctrine."

ARTICLE IV. OF CREATION AND PROVIDENCE.

These really separate doctrines are run together in a superficial way. Article V. concerning Providence in the Brief U. F. Church's Faith is more in keeping with the living mind of the church to-day. (See Appendix VII).

As for the Doctrine of Creation, the biblical cosmology or physical science is no longer acceptable to our scientific age. But Scripture and the spiritual experience of redemption broadly and profoundly conceived affords a standpoint from which to review the world, and pronounce an estimate upon it as a manifestation of God's love. It is His world; in the language of an ancient creed, He is "The Maker of Heaven and Earth."

"Faith does not merely tolerate the facts of science. It accepts them as Divine, and rejoices in the wide reaches of thought they open up, e.g., the process of world formation; the long preparation for the emergence of life, together with the marvels of its development. So much the more glorious is Creation's Lord! So much nearer to His world is the Maker and Sustainer of it!

(1) "God is above all His works and in them all. In trying to conceive the relations of God to the world, logic is often betrayed by its analytic processes. Deism and Pantheism are both logics, not faiths; and both are quite easy as energies of formal thought. Deism separates God from the world, and gives Him at best an engineer's relation to a machine, a portion which may call for occasional interference, but is usually one of dignified leisure. Pantheism identifies God with the world, and misses God in the barren assertion that He is everywhere and in everything. The truth, of course, lies in both affirmations, when stripped of their logical extremities. God is both transcendent and immanent. God is in His world, Nature is a sanctuary in which He dwells; and there He can be worshipped. Or the world is God's Veil, through which He half discloses, half reveals the beauty of His Face.

"God is so good, He wears a fold
  Of heaven and earth across His face—
Like secrets kept, for love, untold."

(2) "God has made man, unique in a world of natural forces. Here also, we must observe the restrictions of faith, which are not really restrictions but are the liberty of its movement. Just as it does not invade cosmology or any of the sciences which deal with the wonders of earth; so it does not occupy the position, or endeavour to supersede

the work, of physiology, or psychology, or any science which deals with the yet greater wonders of man's mysterious frame.

"But it does give an estimate of the position and worth and capacity of man, because in Christ it has the revelation, not of God only, but of man likewise. In the estimate, three elements are noted in Article IV., viz.,

(*a*) Likeness to God, an affinity with God, which is the ground of all God's dealings with man;

(*b*) a religious nature, which demands God for its satisfaction, and reaches its goal only in the Divine fellowship;

(*c*) a moral character, to which freedom and responsibility are essential.

"My opinion is that this article should have been expanded, to include what is implied in Articles XII, XIV, XX, viz., the Vocation of man, to become the organ and instrument of the Divine purpose, i.e., of the Divine holy love, which includes the perfecting of the individual and the service of humanity." (Canadian Theologian).

I like the words of Dr. Donald Fraser: "When sin was altogether absent, as in the case of our Saviour, there was no jar or discord, between the affections and will of the Son of God and the faculties and activities of the Son of Man."

"The whole theme of creation ought to kindle devout feeling. The Lord rejoices in His works, and we, too, should rejoice in them, and speak of the glorious honour of His majesty. The Apostles write of Him as the 'Merciful Creator,' the 'Faithful Creator,' 'O Come! let us worship, and bow down. Let us kneel before the Lord our Maker!'" (Dr. Donald Fraser's *Commentary*).

SECTIONS V.-VII. TREAT OF THE REDEMPTION OF MAN.

Article V. "Of the Sin of Man," deals with the need of man. It gives an antiquated diagnosis of human need, thus:—

(1) The nature of sin; disobedience.
(2) The inheritance of sin.—chose evil.
(3) The universality of sin.
    (1) As tendency: "all men are born with a sinful nature."
    (2) As Act: "have broken God's law."
(4) The power of sin: "come under the power of sin."
    (1) In the individual.
    (2) In society.
(5) The condemnation of sin: "The penalty of sin is eternal death."

I cannot possibly accept Art. V. of the Union Basis. I much prefer Art. IX.—Concerning Sin—of the Brief Statement of the Church's Faith (United Free Church of Scotland), as being much more nearly the expression of the mind of the church of our day. It reads: "We believe that the sin of man was no part of the purpose of God; yet that all men are sinful, and that each of us has been guilty of wilful and repeated sin. We acknowledge that sin separates men from God, and brings them under His condemnation and punishment; and that without His forgiveness and His patient and mighty help no man can deliver himself from either the guilt or the power of his sin."

Principal D. J. Fraser, of Montreal, writing in the Harvard Theological Review (1915), neatly observes:

"There are evidences that the compilers did not always find it an easy task to "mediate" between the traditional and scientific theologies. Take, for instance, *Article* V: "Of the Sin of Man" (also referred to above). Its prescientific account of the origin of sin, its pathological view of human nature, and its crude statement of human solidarity represent a distinct victory for the traditionalists, viz.:—

"We believe that our first parents, being tempted, chose evil, and so fell away from God and came under the power of sin, the penalty of which is eternal death; and that by reason of this disobedience all men are born with a sinful nature, that we have broken God's law, and that no man can be saved but by His grace."

"As a further indication of the theological temper of the compilers take Article VII: 'We believe in and confess the Lord Jesus Christ, the only Mediator between God and Man, who, being the Eternal Son of God, for us men and our salvation became truly man, being conceived of the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary, yet without sin.... For our redemption He fulfilled all righteousness, satisfied Divine justice, and made propitiation for the sins of the whole world.'"

A Presbyterian Professor of Systematic Theology asserts: *"The Doctrine of the Atonement in the Basis is out-of-date* (See Art. VII. "Satisfied Divine Justice.")

Note:—This Article (VII.) was evidently intended to distinguish the Orthodox from the unorthodox church.

Article VI.—The Grace of God.

The Grace of God is magnified, and represented in this Article to be Operative as:

1. Gift; 2. Offer; 3. Power.

1. *The Gift of God.*

(1) The Motive: "Out of His great love."

(2) The Object: "The world, sinners."

(3) The Extent: "Gave His only begotten Son."

(4) The Design and Scope: "To be the Saviour of sinners,—not merely teacher—example—reformer."

2. *The Gospel Offer.*

"The Gospel is wrongly described as an effort of man. It is in fact, the continuance of the act of Divine Grace, which gave the Son, and now offers the salvation which He has perfected. This gives to all preaching and testimony their peculiar sacredness. God gave His Son. God, in the Gospel, offers the great salvation. It is ours not to criticize but to accept or reject this offer of the very love of God meeting us in our need." (Presbyterian Professor).

(*a*) "Its comprehensive nature: Is all sufficient, i.e. there is nothing in which sin has injured man, in respect of which Divine Grace will not restore Him. Enumeration is impossible. (Articles XI. to XIII. form a summary of certain elements of the Christian salvation). Here all that is done is to point out that God has the sinners whole care in view, and having not spared His Own Son, does, in the continuous apprehension of faith freely give us all things. (Rom. 8: 32)."

(*b*) Its universal direction and intention. It is all-availing: "Whosoever will." "All sufficient salvation to all men."

3. *As Creative Power*:

"The world has been wrecked by sin. It can be reconstituted by nothing less than the power of God.

"The difficulty inseparable from human thought, lies in emphasizing the Divine activity, so that it shall not even seem to exclude human freedom and responsibility.

"The Second part of Article VI. represents the endeavour to frame a statement, which shall honour God, without dishonouring man, and so in effect dishonouring man's Creator and Redeemer." (*Ibid*).

(*a*) It describes the redeemed as "innumerable".

(*b*) It characterizes them paradoxically as the Father's "gift".

(*c*) It specifies the purpose of the gift—as holiness and service.

All this is the "sound doctrine" of our fathers. But not sound enough to a few of our venerable Presbyterian Fathers.

For example, the late venerable clerk of the General Assembly, Dr. Campbell, criticizes Art. VI. in these words:—

"Under the Article "Of the Grace of God" it is stated in the proposed Basis that "God from the beginning, in His own good pleasure, gave to His Son a people, an innumerable multitude, chosen in Christ unto holiness, service and salvation." This is a very different statement from that of the Confession of Faith; "Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of His Will hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of His mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature as conditions or causes moving Him thereunto, and all to the praise of His glorious grace." The essential clause in the Basis is "chosen in Christ," and this may be interpreted as union to Christ, the condition of which union is faith, and faith in Christ is an act of free-will; so that it may be contended that the phrase, "Chosen in Christ," means "chosen because of foreseen faith in Christ—which is the doctrine of the Methodist Church, but is certainly not that of the "Confession of Faith." The high doctrine of "Free-Will and Fate" which Scottish artisans have been wont to discuss when they met at the street corners, had not a little to do with shaping Scotch life and character. The Basis does not give that prominence to the Sovereignty of God, His sovereign love as included in His purpose, which characterizes the Confession. The Scottish Reformers, following the Apostle Paul, the great expounder of Christ, replaced God on the throne of the Universe from which He had been pulled down, in the sub-consciousness of Romanists, by the claims of the Priest to be able to create Him in the Mass. Our system make much of God and little of man, except in so far as he is the object of Divine compassion and the subject of saving grace, having for its proper fruit spiritual humility."

Despite the sincere criticism by Dr. Campbell, whose intellectual ability and strong Christian character I shall ever honour, and cherish, my own criticism is from a modern point of view, to the effect that the idea of the God represented in Article VI, in the words, "God, in His own good pleasure gave to His Son a people," is an arbitrary Being who does not appeal to the modern mind. These words smack too much of the old fashioned words of the Question 20 in our Shorter Catechism, viz., "Did God leave all mankind to perish in the estate of sin and misery?"

Answer: "God having, out of his mere good pleasure, from all eternity elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace to deliver them out of the estate of sin and misery, and to bring them into an estate of salvation by a Redeemer."

Yet, if this Article were delivered of its hackneyed theological terms, and given modern expression, I for one could join in spirit with an orthodox writer in his exultant and beautiful conviction: "Who can feel it derogatory to his nature or dignity to be indebted for eternal salvation to the same Supreme Being from Whom he has derived the breath of life, and by Whose daily providence he has been laden with benefits? "Salvation to our God Who sits upon the throne, and to the Lamb for ever."

ARTICLE VII. "OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST."

may be summed up as The Glory of the Redeemer: Jesus is Lord. It speaks of:—

1. *The Glory of His Person*:

(*a*) Son of God. "The eternal Son of God." This excludes Arianism and reaffirms the religious interest of the Nicene Creed.

(*b*) Son of Man: "Became man," showing the Divine love's capacity for self-sacrifice, self-emptying, self-consummation.

1. The genuineness and completeness of His humanity;
2. Its uniqueness and sinlessness. "Yet without sin."
3 Its origin—supernatural—"being conceived by the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary." The Virgin birth is unnecessarily introduced, and is of secondary importance, except to the minds of dogmatic literalists. Yet it has the value of stating the important fact the Lord deigned to enter our estate and world by the ordinary gateway appointed for the children of man.

2. *The Glory of His Work*:

1. "The Revelation of the Father, as His prophetic work:
    (*a*) In His teaching of "by His word."
    (*b*) In His character: "and spirit" i.e., the spirit in Him as afterwards from Him."
2. The Redemption of man, as His priestly work. There is no easy theory for the atonement, which is a mystery of love.

Elements in the Atoning work mentioned in the Article are:—

(*a*) Obedience "fulfilled all righteousness."

(*b*) Sacrifice—"offered Himself a perfect sacrifice on the cross."

(*c*) Satisfaction of justice: "Satisfied Divine justice," and it might have been added, man's sense of right. (Satisfaction of Divine justice is the equivalent of the satisfaction of holy love)."

(*d*) Propitiation for sins of the whole world, i.e., paid the price. The cost of redemption is precious blood."

My note: This is dogmatising the atonement, in a manner unattractive to modern thought.

3. The foundation of the Kingdom—His kingly work, "He created a kingdom or realm of love, as the home of the redeemed."

3. *The Glory of His Risen Life and Mediatorial Sovereignty*:

"He rose from the dead and ascended into heaven."

A Professor of Systematic Theology, with fine spiritual sensitiveness has beautifully said:—"The exercises of our Saviour's mediatorial sovereignty are conducted in three spheres of action:—

(*a*) In heaven; whither as our forerunner He has entered, and where He carries, before God, to full fruition His redemptive work. The ground of our constant forgiveness is still the Cross; and what the Cross was in history, the intercession of Christ is in the heavenly state.

(*b*) In the hearts of believers; which He occupies by His Spirit; fulfilling all the offices of Love, as the Comrade of His people's pilgrimage and warfare, their Friend through all the experiences of the Christian life, their Life, their All.

(*c*) In the universe of God; among the nations, over whom He reigns demanding of them acknowledgment of His Crown Rights, as Redeemer and King; throughout the whole human race, for whom He is the Way to their home in God, as well as the Goal of their long quest; and to the farthest confines of being, for where God is, there is Love, and there is Christ.

Before the exalted Lord, the only attitude of the believing heart is worship. "Wherefore, unto Him we render love, obedience and adoration as our prophet priest, and King."

"It is faith in Him as the Saviour which has formed the church, sustained the martyrs, fired the souls of the missionaries, brought peace to the hearts and brightness to the lives of a great multitude that no man can number." (Fraser's *Commentary*).

The writer feels that a much better statement for purposes of religion to-day, is found in Article II. U. F. Church Statement, (See Appendix VII), concerning the Lord Jesus Christ. He would add most emphatically that this old fashioned doctrine of the atonement in this article is very unfortunate. Like the Westminster Confession "it narrows the doctrine of the Atonement by putting the emphasis upon the expiatory character of Christ's sacrifice, once offered on the Cross, the satisfaction of Divine justice and the purchase of reconciliation with God, thereby involving British Christianity in controversies which have endured till the present time." (Briggs). "The doctrine of the expiatory sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, once made on Calvary, is orthodox, so far as it goes; but it is only a part of a much greater whole, the neglect of which puts the doctrine into an awkward and questionable position, open to attack from many sides" (ibid).

On the other hand, as an orthodox statement of Faith, Article VII.

in the Basis of Union is far from being as adequate as the Westminster or the Old Scottish Confessions.

ARTICLE VIII. "OF THE HOLY SPIRIT."

This Article is almost verbatim from the U. S. Brief Statement, but adds a reference to the procession of the spirit from the Father and the Son as held by the Latin Church, and by the Lutheran and Reformed churches. This addition seems to me reactionary. It is a reversion to a 5th Century credal phrase which explains nothing to us, but originally was used against a mode of Philosophy of the early centuries which conceived of God as the Absolute, and eventually was willing to allow Christ a place, outside the Godhead, but as it were, next to it, and high above the world. So also, the spirit was admitted to a third rank, lower than the Son but still higher than the world. Therefore, the clause referred to was at that time added to prove that, to the Christian, God meant the Father, Son and Spirit, all within the Godhead and not subordinated to one another. To reintroduce it into a Basis of Union to-day, is to assert a 5th century dogma with no meaning for the 20th century.

"The reception of the Spirit," says Dr. Denney, "is the whole of Christianity." Not even by a cogent exposition of the idea, but only by living in the power of the Spirit, can the Christian church survive, and grow, and fulfill its functions. Therefore, from the beginning, the Christian creed has contained this article, "We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, and Giver of Life."

The human life is linked to the glorified Lord through the Spirit, and aided at times by rites, ceremonies, and mechanical links.

Article VIII. states that the operations of the Spirit are manifested,

(1) in the religious history of mankind, "who moves upon the hearts of men to restrain them from evil and to incite them unto good;"

(2) in the religious history of Israel: "has spoken by holy men of God;"

(3) in the history of the Christian salvation: "through our exalted Saviour. He was sent forth in power."

"In the history of redemption," says a Canadian Professor of Divinity, "the gift of the Spirit in unrestricted power could not be granted, while as yet the ministry of the Messiah was unfulfilled.

"But when the Redeemer had fulfilled His vocation, and was exalted by the act of God, the Spirit was poured forth in unrestricted fullness. Pentecost is the birthday of the church, the inauguration of the Christian salvation. The Acts of the Apostles, the rest of New Testament literature, Christian biography, the history of missions at home and abroad, constitute one long record of the work of the Spirit. That work is viewed in the Article, in two aspects:

(*a*) "That which concerns the world in its ignorance of God, and in its helplessness. The Spirit—1. Convicts of sin; 2. Enlightens men's minds in the knowledge of Christ; 3. "Persuades and enables" them to trust and obey."

(*b*) "That which concerns the church, viz., the company of those who, through God's word and spirit, have accepted Christ, as Redeemer and King. As the Spirit has created the church, so "He abides with it." As He has enabled men to believe, so "He dwells in every believer," and has carried out in the life story of the redeemed the purposes of redeeming grace, giving light in darkness, power in weakness, holiness instead of sin, comfort to all the weary and heavy laden, and "all things" comprehended in God's holy love."

It is noteworthy that in many creeds and confessions (as in the Westminster) there is no statement regarding the Holy Spirit other than is contained in the affirmations regarding God and the Holy Trinity. The Apostles' Creed has simply: "I believe in the Holy Ghost." The Nicene, besides the statement of the Spirit's Divine rank and glory, says that it is He who vivifies, and that "He spake by the prophets." The "Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church" (A.D. 1643), following and expanding the Nicene Statement, gives a full and valuable exposition of the gifts and operations of the Holy Spirit. Of the Reformed Confessions the only one which does any justice to this theme is the Scottish, which devotes a whole Article (Art. 12) to "Faith in the Holy Ghost," carefully ascribing to Him the regeneration and sanctification of man."

My view is that the Article (VIII.) "Of the Holy Spirit" was framed not merely in dependence on the sources used by those who compiled the doctrinal Basis of Union, but also to please the Methodists who have always given a prominent place to the Spirit in their teaching, preaching, and experience, although their Article IV. "Of the Holy Spirit", in their Articles of Religion is brief, viz., "The Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son (Note the procession clause as in the Basis of Union but not in the American Brief Statement from which the rest of the Article was taken), is of one substance, majesty and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God."

It seems to me that Art. III. Concerning the Holy Spirit, in the U. F. Church's Statement of Faith (See Appendix VII) is vastly superior and not controversial, as contrasted with the Article in the Basis of Union.

ARTICLE IX. OF REGENERATION.

A Presbyterian Divine gives a very orthodox but suggestive interpretation of this Article, in connection with the Christian life.

"Plainly, it is not the outcome of any power resident in those who are implicated in the fact of sin. The Kingdom of Sin is around and over and within us. We have all yielded ourselves its subjects. If a new beginning for the race and for the individual, is to be made, it must be made by the act of God as Holy Love. For the race, that beginning was the birth into it of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. For the individual, it is his birth into the Kingdom of God. "Birth," or "Regeneration," is one of the metaphors in which Scripture expresses the quality of the New Life. It is new; not a prolongation, or improvement upon the old. It is a new creation "in Christ Jesus, by the Spirit of God." The making, and the remaking of a man are alike Divine acts. Creation and Redemption are both shere miracles; therefore they are the work of God, before which we, wonder and adore. They are not a work which is, in part, our own, for which therefore we may take partial credit. When a soul turns to the light, and seeing Jesus, falls down at His feet, and rises in

His strength to follow and obey Him, we discern, not a precarious effort of man, but "the gracious and mysterious operation of Divine Power (See Art. IX)."

The action of the Divine Power is mysterious, but not magical.

(1) *It uses means, as Article* IX. *states.*

(*a*) "the truths of His (God's) Word."

(*b*) "the ordinances of Divine appointment."

"We have thus the warrant for the diligent use of the catechetical, and other instrumentalities, whereby the young are brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, as well as the assurance that the preaching of the Gospel, and the maintenance of church fellowship and institutions, will be employed by the Divine Spirit for the regeneration of the individual and of society."

(2) *The Divine Power of Spirit operates in harmony with human nature, itself a Divine work.*

"The Divine Spirit never treats a man as other than human. The relation of man to God is not that of inorganic to organic; a false analogy. Man is not a stock or stone."

"The Spirit operates in full recognition of the constitution of human nature, and "in ways agreeable thereto" (See Art. IX) i.e., corresponding to the Divine image wherein man was created. Men may, indeed, take the Kingdom of heaven by violence (Mat. 11:12). But God never violates the nature, which He would redeem. Dr. Denney says, "God confronts men in Christ." Jesus confronts men with His claim and promise in the Gospel. The Power of God to save is by the Spirit moving upon and within the human spirit. Redemption includes action on God's part and reaction on man's part. No partial reaction or response of man is adequate. "In the presence of the redeeming God, there is no place for reserve. Unworthy man's only place is in the dust before God, at Jesus' feet, in full surrender. The subjective experiences, accompanying this reaction, will vary infinitely; and their varieties are worth studying, especially for purposes of "personal work." Fundamentally, the action of man in relation to Redemption is two-fold,—Faith and Repentance" (See Article X).

This Article in the U. S. Creed is entitled "Of New Birth and the New Life", and the first part of its Article on Election is dovetailed in the Basis of Union into the Article "Of the Grace of God". Election is dropped in the Union creed to avoid contention, whereas in the English Articles it forms part of the Article "Of Election and Regeneration". These contentious terms find no place in Article headings of the U. F. Church's statement. (See Appendix VII).

ARTICLE X. OF FAITH AND REPENTANCE.

"Fundamentally the action of man in relation to the Redemption is twofold:—Faith and Repentance.

Faith is described, in the Article, in familiar language, viz., "Receiving" Christ, "Trusting in Him," "Resting upon Him." Any words will do which express an act which means the surrender of the whole man to God in Christ, a believing self-commitment to Him for His reception, and His employment, once for all, for time and for eternity.

The act of faith, is not of a faculty, e.g. intellect, feeling or will, but of the whole man, throwing himself on God in Christ.

This act, which in its God-ward movement is faith, is in its reference to that which has separated it from God, repentance, "Wherein we confess and forsake our sins with full purpose of and endeavour after a new obedience to God" (Art. X).

ARTICLES XI. AND XII. "OF JUSTIFICATION AND SONSHIP" AND "OF SANCTIFICATION."

It has been said of these Articles: "Here, too, we are moving within the liberties of faith, imperilled by the sacerdotalism of the Medieval church, claimed in the Reformation, and committed to all who have in their hands the New Testament Scriptures and who serve themselves heirs to the great evangelical succession."

"The Basis seeks to present the benefits, which are bestowed "freely with Christ," in their simplicity and in their magnificence, realizing that a gift is also a task, a promise at the same time a duty, and that no precious thing in the Gospel is to be neglected by those who profess to receive it."

ARTICLE XI. "OF JUSTIFICATION AND SONSHIP".

The first precious thing that is bestowed on the believer is forgiveness. Forgiveness is not a dream, but a fact!

(*a*) *Its Ground*: "the perfect obedience and sacrifice of Christ" (See Article XI.) is the "sole ground."

(*b*) *Its objects*: "Those who by faith receive Him as their Saviour and Lord." (See Article XI.).

(*c*) *Its Declaration*: (1) Negative, "pardons" (See Art. XI.)
(2) Positive, "accepts as righteous, (See Art. XI.)
A new standing a new start are ushered in.

The second precious benefit or inheritance of the redeemed is sonship toward God. This was the goal of creation. It was attained in Christ, and is attained by all that are His.

Sonship:

(*a*) Is a relationship conferred on faith as it receives Christ; Jno. 1:12. "Bestows upon them the adoption of sons. (See Art. XI.). (*b*) Sonship carries with it heirship; Rom. 8: 15-17, "with a right to all the privileges therein implied" (See Art. XI.). (*c*) Sonship—childhood—a fact of experience, meant to be made theme of joyous confidence and praise; I. Jno. 3: 1-3, "a conscious assurance of sonship." (See Art. XI.).

"Assurance is never to be separated from the act of faith. If decadent, it is to be regained in reverent act of faith. It is never to be sought for itself alone, and glorified in as an achievment. It is never to be rejected, in unreal penitence, or mock humility, or mere worldliness."

This Article seems to me altogether too forensic, and lacking in spiritual and ethical dynamic. Note especially the words, "on the sole ground....accepts them as righteous and bestows upon them the adoption of sons...." In days gone by, it had a mighty power, but the emphasis has been shifted in modern thought and Christian experience away from forensic literalism to a profounder spiritual faith with its more ethical and humanitarian resultant.

Finally, and in reference to *Sonship in Christ*: This Article sufficiently intimates that we do not here speak of a filial relation borne of all mankind to a universal Father. "Such universal Fatherhood is not a distinctive tenet of Christianity. It was known to the ancients. St. Paul recognises it only in a quotation from a heathen poet: "We are His offspring," What this Article treats of is something far more intimate and definite. It is the Fatherhood of God in relation to those who are vitally united to Christ. The Jews, who rejected our Lord, said confidently that God was their Father; but Christ rejected this claim. If God were their Father, they would love and not hate, His only begotten Son. So also now it is in vain that Christ-rejecting men prate confidently about the Fatherhood of God. Our Lord gave the right to become children of God to those who received Him and believed on His name. In this sense, at all events, sonship cannot be universal, unless faith and justification by faith are universal also." (R. Fraser—*Sound Doctrine*).

ARTICLE XII. "OF SANCTIFICATION"

The third benefit that is ours in Christ is holiness. "Article XII. is a careful statement of this precious gift. It avoids the unreality of negatives or abstractions about Sanctification and its correlates.

"Briefly summarized the Article (XII.) sets forth holiness as to:

(*a*) *Its Nature*: "Growth in, or into the likeness of Christ"—a progressive development, with nothing less than that as its goal.

(*b*) *Its Conditions*: (i) "Fellowship with Christ." Christianity involves the friendship of Christ. (ii) "The indwelling of the Holy Spirit." Christianity calls for the receptance of the Spirit. (iii) "Obedience." Christianity necessitates the doing of the will of God.

(*c*) *Its Value*: It can be produced only by faith. It is in fact faith's inevitable manifestation, its "fruit" and "evidence." Without it, there is no proof of faith. It is not a luxury, but a necessity.

(*d*) *Its Permanence*: It is holiness by faith, the counterpart of faith is the keeping power of God.

(*e*) *Its Goal in this Life*: The New Testament answer is perfection. The Article reads "We believe that in this growth in grace Christians may attain that maturity and full assurance of faith whereby the love of God is made perfect in us." Perfection is often mistaken for sinlessness. Whereas it means the maturity of a man in Christ. The note of that "maturity and full assurance, is not emotionalism, nor intellectualism, but sacrificial love." That Goal, itself a "flying goal," has been attained in multitudes of sacrificial lives. Its pursuit is not optional, but a binding and constant duty. Evangelical perfection obviously far transcends "Legalism" (i) because its standard is higher, viz., love, holy, redeeming; (ii) because it carries power with it, the power of the Living Lord, the indwelling Spirit."

A keen critic of staunch Presbyterian convictions remarks: "Note the extravagance of the concession to the Methodists, that we may have assurance of possessing the perfect love of God."

A Prominent Clerk of Presbytery writes: "The doctrinal statement does not furnish us with a reasonable safety to the church in the Articles (on Scripture, Sin, Christ, Sacraments) Sanctification, and Christian Institutions." He much prefers the present standards of the Presbyterian church.

In the brief English Article, the title is "Of Sanctification and Perseverance," although the words "sanctification" and "perseverance" are not in the Article itself. No doubt the reason of this is, that the compilers had it in view (as did the compilers of our doctrinal Articles of Union) to explain technical terms of theology, but not to use them more than could be helped. With the Union compilers the motive was clearly the avoidance of contentious discussion.

"It is quite clear we have, in the Articles, "Of Revelation", "Of the Divine Purpose," and "Of Sanctification," examples of the various elements which have to be co-ordinated in any theology ere it can satisfy the religious life of men, rather than a well thoughtout theology. A similar regard for the religious life in its fullness rather than for a premature formulation of that life in definition is seen in the Article "Of Sanctification", which preserved for the new church that emphasis on personal religion which aroused so much misunderstanding and hostility for the early Methodists." (E. Thomas,—*The American Journal of Theology,* July, 1919).

The reader is advised to read over Articles IX to XII (inclusive) in the doctrinal Basis of Union, and then the strong Articles of the Westminster Confession by way of contrast. Chapters XI-XV and XVIII, of the latter. Art. XI. on Justification, is an admirable statement of the great doctrine of the Reformation, except so far as High Calvinism warps its statements, and so puts it in conflict with the chapter on Effectual Calling and confuses the order of salvation. Articles XII-XV, of Adoption, Sanctification, Saving Faith, Repentance unto Life, are new chapters in Symbolic Theology, and the choicest parts of the Confession and the chief contribution of Puritan theology to the enrichment of the Christian Faith. Unfortunately these have been ignored by the theologians and the ministry, because they were apart from the theological conflicts between Arminianism and Calvinism, and between the Old and the New School of Calvinism. "Chapter XVIII. Of Assurance of Grace and Salvation, is another admirable chapter because it is an advance upon all previous Symbols in a normal, and not a polemic direction. It distinguishes between Faith and the Assurance of Faith, and clearly explains the nature of each." (*Theological Symbolics*—Briggs).

ARTICLES XIII, XIV, AND XX.

"The climax of privilege. The Christian life has its source in God. In God, also, it reaches its consummation. That consummation is described in Articles XIII, 'Of Prayer,' and XIV, 'Of the Law of God,' in two aspects:

1. *Communion with God.* Article XIII. The Life of Prayer.

The Christian life is, in its deepest significance, a life of prayer. The warrant and power of prayer, rest in the name of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. The scope of prayer is everything that affects ourselves, and all men. The spirit of prayer is the humility and filial liberty of children. The parts of prayer are adoration, confession and supplication, fashioned after the Lord's Prayer. The aim of prayer is the glory of God, and the full salvation here and hereafter. The certainty of the answer is given in and with Christ—in whom are hid all the treasures of the Divine Love.

2. *The Service of God*: Articles XIV, "Of the Law of God," and XX, "Of Christian Service and the Final Triumph."

"Communion without service is vain. Service without communion, if not impossible, is at least far from being fullorbed. Service is the crowning act of faith; the continuance, in and through the church, of the God's righteous will and recreating love. There is no higher privilege. It includes:

1) *Fulfillment of the Moral Law* (See Art. XIV) as set forth in the "Ten Words," in prophetic interpretation, and in Christ, and is articulated in every true believer's life, in so far as it responds to the challenge of God to fulfill his responsibility of "doing justly, loving mercy and walking humbly with his God." The humanity of Christ was perfected in a consistent and loving obedience to the righteous Father. He is no child of God who has not respect to His commandments.

(2) *Extension of the Kingdom of God,* i.e., of the Divine sovereignty over men in society, so that through harmony with the will of our Heavenly Father the brotherhood of man may be established in all departments of life, sacred and secular, national and international.

(3) *Evangelization of the World.* "The Kingdom of God is among you," announced Jesus. It comes continually in the faith and devotion of those who own Him Lord. This is our crowning privilege, that we, who are the subjects of Divine love, should be employed in the King's business, and should in our daily ministry of faith and love, extend His sovereignty, and prepare for His final victory." (See Art. XX.).

ARTICLE XV. OF THE CHURCH AND OF SACRAMENTS ART. XVI.

"Methodism is a society, not a church," says a learned Professor of our Presbyterian Communion, who proceeds to add, "Presbyterianism is a Catholic Church, stressing the church and sacraments. This emphasis is lacking in the Basis of Union. Presbyterianism was never a sect so that Presbyterians have never been sectarians. The Methodists have never been anything else than sectarians wherever they had a church. Presbyterians in their purity pride themselves on their traditional High

Church position. There never has been any Low Church position in Scotland—hence never fierce sectarians, but the so-called low position was due simply to carelessness in the matter of Church Order and Sacraments."

A Professor of Systematic Theology recommends a close study of "Calvin's Institutes," Book IV. Chap. I. for a very possible modern statement "Of the Church". Mainly Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11 and 12 are mentioned, in this connection.

This Article XV. in Basis of Union is taken verbatim from The Articles of the Faith of the Presbyterian Church of England, except for the addition of "and other baptized children", and the substitution of "the proclamation of the Gospel" in place of "the universal propagation of the Gospel." (See Chapter III, B, above).

The reader would do well to study Dr. Fraser's commentary on the corresponding English Article XVI. (*Sound Doctrine,* pp. 159-169). The curious discovery will be made that the said Article literally taken over by the compilers of the Basis of Union, does not support the conception of an organically United Church such as that proposed in Canada; on the contrary, that the "unity must be and is in spirit, not in form."

"With this conception of the one (spiritual) church of God in our minds, we are not much perplexed or alarmed by the diversities of church order which appear........ the multiplication of churches does not invade the unity of the church spiritual and essential, to which perpetuity and universality belong........ Ubi Christus, ibi ecclesia." (ibid).

"The doctrine of the church, here stated, entirely corresponds with the teaching of the Reformed Confessions. It has no breath of sectarianism, but is large-souled and genuinely catholic. Two thoughts are dominant in this Article (I) The spiritual unity of the church, (2) The distinction between the church in its Divine ideal and the church in manifestation and profession." (ibid).

I beg to suggest as a real doctrine of the church for the purpose of union, Article VII, concerning the Church in U. F. Church's Brief Statement of Faith (See Appendix VII).

ARTICLE XVI. OF THE SACRAMENTS.

A very influential Professor stated to me in an interview: "The new basis of union, despite its claim to Catholicity, acknowledges only *two sacraments,* viz., Baptism and the Lord's Supper. This is negative, whereas a positive statement is needed. There are churches with more sacraments than two, and this statement negatively put in the Basis is not catholic and implies the denial of other sacraments to other believers in what ought to be a universal catholic church. Furthermore, the Basis is ghastly in regard to the Ministry—because there is absolutely no place for the grace of Ordination. Ordination is really a sacrament with pure Presbyterians—so said John Knox."

"The Latin and Greek churches recognize seven sacraments; giving this title not only to the two which we all acknowledge, but also to confirmation, penance, holy orders, matrimony, and extreme unction. At the other extreme some modern sects dispense with all sacraments, e.g., the Friends (Quakers), who think that spirituality is opposed to symbolic rites, and the Salvation Army, which in practice neglects sacraments, though not committed in principle to their rejection. In common with all Protestant and Reformed churches we acknowledge two sacraments only: Baptism and the Lord's Supper." (Fraser's *Commentary*).

"While due honour is paid to the two sacraments of the New Testament, it is necessary to beware of exaggeration. Baptismal waters do not produce regeneration; nor does the Lord's Supper nourish the spiritual life by any mystic power in the elements or by virtue of the devout intention of the ministrant"........ "if the observance should be precluded salvation is not forfeited, grace is not withheld."........ "For us the sacraments are more than venerable forms, or even mnemonic rites; but, on the other hand, they are not invariable conduits of saving grace. One man thinks Baptism a ceremony; another regards it as regeneration. Both are wrong. It is much more than a ceremony; but then it is only the sign and pledge, not the mystic instrument of regeneration. The Holy Communion is in the eyes of some a social, fraternal meal; in the eyes of others, the occasion of a dread sacrifice offered at an altar. Again we avoid the extremes. At the table of the Lord we witness and share an impressive solemnity, a commemoration of the death of Christ, and a communion of His people with Him in faith and love, highly instructive, corroborative, and consolatory to all the members of His spiritual Body." (Fraser's *Commentary*).

"The Westminster Confession is a compromise, the barest minimum of Presbyterianism accepted grudgingly by English men, as an instrument towards uniformity. Therefore, it is our right and duty as catholic Presbyterians to keep up the traditions of Scotland which are far higher than the Westminster Confession. (Cf. 1st Scottish Confession with Westminster Confession)". (See Articles I. and XIV. for criticism of deficiency of Basis in catholicity).

Baptism: (Article XVI. (1) Note the shallow exegesis—"into" not "in" the hallowed name as heretofore. Simply because the Greek "eis" is used we have this irresponsible, juvenile exegesis. The compilers of the Basis, however, merely copied this from the English Article.

Article XVI. (2) *The Lord's Supper.* A Presbytery Clerk protests that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is not defined in the Basis, but left to be decided after Union. He claims that the Westminster Confession Article (XXVII), "Of the Sacraments", is superior to the Union Article.

ARTICLES XVI. AND XVII.

"I regard the want of doctrine of ministry and sacraments as a grave defect in the Basis of Union. We are I fear somewhat like Esau who despised his heritage—for we have as Presbyterians a heritage in regard to ministry and sacraments that is worth saving. Perhaps we can save it best by not putting it on paper, but if we do not have it on paper it will be hard to prove to the Anglicans that we have it at all," (Presbyterian Professor).

ARTICLE XVII. OF THE MINISTRY.

A scholarly Presbyterian Divine writes: "There is a distinct lowering of the standard of the ministry in Art. XVII, where we read "Jesus Christ........ has *appointed* therein a ministry, &c," instead of "God (in Christ) has *given* to the church, &c." That is to say the new idea is one of appointment, not the old idea of the grace of God through ordination. (See Westminster Confession Chapter XXV. 3).

ARTICLE XVII, AND XVIII, (OF CHURCH ORDER AND FELLOWSHIP).

"In view of yet later possible developments in the unification of Christianity it is noteworthy that no definite statement concerning the ministry or the government of the church is set forth to be a further embarrassment. The Lord Jesus Christ "has appointed a ministry of the word and sacraments and calls man to this ministry" and the "church under the guidance of the Spirit of Christ recognizes and chooses those whom He calls and should thereupon duly ordain them to the work of the ministry".... (Art. XVII). "The worship, teaching, discipline, and government of the church should be administered according to His will by persons chosen for their fitness and duly set apart to their office" (Article XVIII).

"It is clear that the doctrinal statement is carefully drawn with a view to inclusiveness rather than prematurely to exclude by negative definition. And in this character more than in any other specific statement the essential spirit and aim of the declaration of faith are revealed." (E. Thomas,—*The American Journal of Theology*, July, 1919).

The writer feels that the straining after "inclusiveness" in the Basis is a weakness rather than a strength resulting in:

(1) *Illogical Arrangement.* The order ought to be (*a*) Church, (*b*) Order, (*c*) Ministry (or as High Anglicans put it, Orders).

Organization should come immediately after the church.

Church Order and Fellowship are not to be separated from the Ministry.

(2) *The substance of Articles* XVII. *and* XVIII. *are thin and inadequate.* It is a minimum statement less than catholic and expressed in a confused manner. The latter part of XVIII. is a light reference to the doctrine of the church; the rest of it is about the ministry. There is no statement about church order,—viz., preaching, sacraments, discipline. No definite declaration concerning the ministry or government of the church is too great a price to pay for the union proposal. It affords no protection for the stability and dignity of the church. Discipline is neglected. The reference to the extension of fellowship may be taken either as a hint at missions or with reference to the unification of Christianity. The latter is not at all likely to happen (See Chapt. I. C. above, for practical and theological reasons). Certainly the Articles here are so loosely thrown together and so lacking in catholicity, that they would serve to retard rather than advance the One Catholic Church in which union advocates profess to believe. The Articles are very trivial as compared with the Old Scottish Confession. (See Knox's Works, Vol. II, p. 112). (See my Chap. IV).

ARTICLE XIX.

The Conclusion of the Articles should really be Article XIX. "Of the Resurrection, the Last Judgment, and the Future Life."

In cryptic words, one of our professors deals with this Article thus: "The great salvation is not exhausted in time. Its consummations lie beyond. Of the events in which the transition takes effect, Faith must ever speak with reserve, while holding fast their reality—Resurrection, "Parousia," Judgment. Its grace passes then to that which they believe in, the "Life Eternal". "Satisfied with the likeness."

"Suppose unbelief, rejection of Christ, what issue? How escape, if we neglect? To-day if ye will hear His voice?"—harden not your hearts." (ibid).

Articles XIX. *and* XX. have blended the article headings of the English Articles (See Appendix II), but have not used their longer verbiage. Yet they implicitly point forward to a final and conclusive judgment which is to wind up the whole drama of world history, and to determine and close in catastrophic fashion the long strife between good and evil. This apocalyptic piece of theology is somewhat mollified as to the terrible doctrine of eternal punishment, by the use of "the *finally* impenitent" in place of the *"wicked"* (shall go into eternal punishment.... Matt. XXV). Neither does this assertion go so far as the Westminster Confession which declares that the wicked are "cast into eternal torments," which has been pictured in Dante's *Inferno.*

Why introduce this vicious thought of God into the creed of the proposed United Church. *Better* far turn to the more spiritual and Christian Article (XII) of the *U. F. Church's Brief Statement,* "Concerning the Life to Come." (See Apendix VII).

My own conviction is that this Union *Article* (XIX) is too antiquated to deserve a place in a modern Statement of Faith. It is Jewish Apocalyptic doctrine rather than Christian.

ARTICLE XX. OF CHRISTIAN SERVICE AND THE FINAL TRIUMPH.

(See also Articles XIV and XV).

An able Presbytery Clerk of Orthodox persuasion severely criticizes this Article thus:

(*a*) "There is no definite pronouncement on worship. The Article does not define its nature or its methods. It gives a bare statement, "It is our duty to maintain the public and private worship of God." There is nothing in this to forbid a minister from introducing any kind of worship he likes—candles, crosses, images, &c. The Union creed does not protect us here, and how can a *Protestant* vote for such liberty.

(*b*) "The same is true of the Lord's Day, "It is our duty to hallow the Lord's day." How? Any way we like, every man is left to do that which is right in his own eyes. If in his opinion he thinks it best to attend church in the morning and to give the afternoon to the business of pleasure, he may. Thus the Basis which should define more clearly the Sabbath, by such omissions really surrenders it, and yet we are asked to accept this weak piece of doctrine.

(*c*) "The all important subject of marriage which is vital to church and state is dismissed in the Basis with "It is our duty to preserve the inviolability of marriage." Could anything be more insipid? This would not interfere with the "ne temere decrees," nor with Mormonism. This does not protect Christian marriage. The new church will be able to welcome the divorcee and the divorced, and it will be in vain to say we have still the Sacraments behind the Doctrinal Statement."

I offer a further criticism of my own, that the statement of *the Article about the Kingdom of God is hackneyed,* warlike, and inadequate. It is very inferior to Article (VI) of the U. F. Church's Statement both as to Christian expression and social gospel. (See Appendix VII). The *Basis of Union is doctrinally an individualistic gospel* here and throughout the Articles, in which you cannot find more than the slightest and vaguest references to the Modern Social Gospel. This omission is a serious defect.

Addendum II.

IS THERE NOT A WAY OUT?

THE FEDERAL CHURCH OF CANADA

A MEMORANDUM BY REV. D. R. DRUMMOND, D.D., ST. PAUL'S CHURCH, HAMILTON, ONT.

FOREWORD

As a working minister in touch with scores of fellow-ministers I, like them, have been greatly disturbed for months past by the Church Union situation.

As one who has been somewhat closely connected with the general work of the church, I have been alarmed because despite the most rigid economy and even heart-breaking retrenchment and a Special Offering of $143,000, we have been forced to add, in 1922, to our net Deficit $55,000.

There never was a time when as a Church we had greater need of the full service of every minister and of every gift of money, and yet I find minister after minister being wholly withdrawn from his work, pulpit and pastoral, and many tens of thousands of dollars being spent on rival propaganda.

Should the coming General Assembly decide to press on for Legislation, it is, in my judgment, inevitable, that many past sources of support will be dried up and much enthusiasm and sympathy be alienated.

In these straits my heart is cheered and sustained by my faith in the large body of moderate opinion throughout the Church...."the quiet of the land"....who pray much and love much.

My hope is that they, moved by God's Spirit, will become vocal *to* and *through* the commissioners to the General Assembly, and *insist* on a Way of Peace being *found* and *followed*. "The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated."

As my humble but very earnest contribution toward finding a "way out", I offer the following Plan, which I venture to think might register, in organized form, the spirit of fellowship which has been growing through these years of discussion and conference and which might conserve undivided and undiminished all our resources for the tasks that challenge.

D. R. DRUMMOND

IS THERE NOT A WAY OUT?

With perfect frankness I wish to say that the primary purpose of this proposed "Way Out," is the desire to keep unbroken the ranks of the Presbyterian Church and thereby also "Keep Faith" in deepest fact with the other negotiating Churches, and above all, best serve the interests of Christ's Kingdom at home and abroad.

Some in both parties in the Presbyterian Church, or in the other Churches may think that this "way out" aims at or tends less or more surely toward Organic Union, and others, that it has or is calculated to have the most opposite effect. Every man must judge for himself what he thinks the effect would be. It may be that the expectations of either issue are about six of one and half a dozen of the other, but I must ask to be believed when I say that I am not aiming at either issue. My primary purpose is an undivided Church and the blessings therewith. "To peace are ye called." Forced disruption, be the blame whose it may, is playing with fire. It is easy to talk of dissolving partnership and going our separate ways, but the interlacing of the memories and associations of affectionate co-working for long years, makes that like pulling up a tree by the roots and accompanied as it will be by bitterness and strife, will blight and destroy the fruit of the tree—love, joy, peace.

In my judgment, this plan might be adopted by the next General Assembly without prejudice to the decisions of any former General Assemblies. It is the outcome of the sincere conviction that the attempt to press on now to Organic Union would be very injurious to all our interests, Union included. It is an act of faith that the future will bring its own gifts of wisdom and guidance.

But while my primary purpose is as stated above, I desire this proposal to be earnestly considered on its own merits. It is not intended for a moment as a mere makeshift or compromise. It is presented as, at the least, an adequate alternative in our present difficulty and in the hope that it may open the way along which a permanent settlement may be found.

I. GENERAL

Inside and outside the Presbyterian Church, there is widespread anxiety by reason of the Church Union situation. Within that Church are two strongly organized parties carrying forward an eager propaganda. Uneasiness and even distrust and suspicion are church-wide. The issue threatens serious disruption of the Church's fellowship and service, with bitterness, heart-burning, lobbying and litigation that will certainly rob the Union, even if attained, of much of its finest fruitage.

Since very early in the discussion on Organic Union, I have felt and still feel that there is no gain in prospect through it that will offset any serious schism in the Presbyterian Church—a Church which, with her well-knit organization and sacrificial loyalty is not the least effective among the Churches of our land or least abundant in labours of love, or least qualified, through her noble traditions and her growing wealth and awakening missionary interest, to do, if united within herself a work for Canada and the world that will bless men and cheer the heart of her great King and Head. Therefore, I feel that whatever is best for her unity is best also for the whole Union Movement, and is the true "keeping of Faith" with the sister negotiating Churches and with her own people.

For a great many years, I have been convinced that if we are ever to have Union in peace, it must be progressively attained, a slow growth, through mutually trustful co-operation. I cannot yet bring my mind to the thought of any solution of our present difficulty that involves a definite division of our Presbyterian ranks. That is to me a horror too unspeakable.

II. PLAN SUGGESTED

To meet this difficulty, I venture to propose a Plan which has the idea of a Federal Union as its organizing idea. It is based on two facts:

(1) That all parties unanimously favor the fullest possible measure of co-operation.

(2) That our legal advisers tell us that we can have an Ecclesiastical Union without goint to the Legislatures at all (Assembly Minutes, 1922, Page 510).

My Plan is:—Let the negotiating Churches, together with the Council of Independent Union Churches (which has expressed its willingness and desire to enter the United Church of Canada), lay their plans to federate or unite themselves into an Ecclesiastical but not a Legal Entity, to be called "The Federal Church of Canada," (or it might be called "The United Church of Canada", or "The Free Church of Canada," or any other name agreed upon).

(*a*) Such a Church would be as free as the Presbyterian Church in Canada is to-day, in the sense that it is not incorporated. It is constituted by the appropriate decisions of the proper courts of the negotiating Churches without seeking legislation from the Federal Parliament or the Provincial Legislatures. In my thought the Units would retain their identity and autonomy (save as by their own consent they assigned to the Federal Church certain powers in general matters) and their property. The organs (Board of Trustees or other bodies) by which the Units now hold their property, would continue as the organs by which their property would still be held. If the Federal Church came to possess property, as for example: Institutions for work among the Non-Anglo-Saxon or Redemptive Homes, Etc., the expense of which was distributed among the Units, she could easily create an organ to meet that situation and hold such properties in trust for her. It simplifies our whole problem very greatly if we do not have to deal with property or go to the Legislatures at all.

(*b*) The Independent Union Churches have now as their Basis the Basis of Union for the proposed United Church of Canada and they would bring into the Federal Church that as their Basis. I think that the Federal Church when constituted, might very well consider the adopting of that Basis as "setting forth the Christian Faith as commonly held among us. In doing so, we build upon the foundation laid by the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the Chief Corner-Stone." (The Basis of Union, opening sentence on "Doctrine.") The Polity of that Basis might be regarded as suggestive of that toward which all the Units might seek to approximate.

Or in lieu of that Basis, the Federal Church might frame and adopt some other statement setting forth the great verities of the Christian Faith.

(*c*) On the administrative side, I would expect that for the immediate present, the Units would retain their separate Boards and Departments, but would forthwith set themselves to see how far unification could be wisely accomplished, e.g., could they with profit have one Home Mission Board for all work in Canada, Newfoundland, and the Bermudas and one Foreign Mission Board for all missions in other lands? Could the same Home Mission Superintendent care for the work of *all* the Units in the area under his oversight, so saving overhead in men, labour, and expense in travel? So with Social Service and Sunday School Work; with publicity and missionary literature, and Sunday School and other publications; with campaign for budget and evangelism, and with training of men for the Ministry. Throughout, the principle would rule that wherever benefit, financial or spiritual, promises to accrue, or the interests involved are common to all the Units, the forces of all the Units would be brought under common leadership. The specific interests of each would be left entirely in the control of the respective Unit. Naturally all this would require to be worked out with the same care that is observed in defining the relationships in a Federation of States or Provinces.

I presume that the Federal Church of Canada would be formally constituted, with appropriate ceremony, at a duly arranged for meeting or series of meetings, of officially appointed Commissioners. There might well be, as a token of their unity, a solemn act of recognition of each other's membership and a commissioning each of the other's ministry. At a suitable date, there might be a Canada-wide exchange of pulpits to be followed by a chain of Preaching Missions (Evangelistic or Missionary) from coast to coast by specially selected missioners from the various Units.

On the letter-head of paper used by the various Boards of the Units, would appear perhaps, a general heading. "The Federal Church of Canada" and under it the name of the Units issuing, thus:

FEDERAL CHURCH OF CANADA
Congregational Church Section

So with our various Sunday-School Publications, and the Church Papers, like "The Presbyterian Witness" (if indeed we each continued separate organs and did not rather unitedly plan the finest religious weekly that we could produce).

It would bring the Units together in *method* at least if they observed the same Church Year and used the same Forms for receiving Statistical and Financial Reports.

By means like these the *fact* of Union would be openly proclaimed.

(*d*) The Federal Church will require Officers and some Court or Courts, composed of duly appointed Commissioners from the Units with duties and powers assigned. The suggestion made for The United Church of Canada I would adopt, and call the Supreme Court "The General Council." I think that it should meet annually and be composed of perhaps not more than 100 or 125 commissioners.

Such a "Council" would provide an area for the expression and cultivation of the spirit of Christian unity and become an instrument, which, through the Units represented therein, might liberate forces that would make for the firmer establishment of religion in the life of the nation.

Its duties might embrace what is included under such well understood terms as:

(1) Church Life and Work or Religion and Life.
(2) Missionary Education.
(3) Questionaires.
(4) Such other duties as the Units might approve in the light of experience.

III. SOME OBJECTIONS TO PLAN.

(1) "The Plan does not contemplate a "Church" at all, properly speaking. A "Church" implies a common credal statement and a central authority running throughout the whole."

ANSWER:—I grant that we are giving to the word "Church" a new content. The name "*Federal Church*" declares that. We have in Great Britain a Free Church Council and in the United States a Federal Council of Churches (plural) and they are what their name suggests, Councils or Committees. My Plan calls for a "Church" (singular)—The Federal Church of Canada.

True, to the best of my knowledge, there is nowhere in the world such a Church to-day, but that is in itself no argument against it. God is ever calling new things into being and men are regularly giving new meanings to old words. Why should not we in Canada venture this new thing? A Federal Church with credal statement adequate (see above II. (b)), and with powers, functions and duties properly set forth, (see above II., (d)), a definitely organized Ecclesiastical Entity, as truly such as the Presbyterian Church in Canada is to-day?

(2) "The Plan offers nothing new. The idea of Federal Union was discussed twelve or fifteen years ago and discarded."

(*a*) ANSWER:—Even were it true that this Plan offers nothing new, it would not follow that it is not the highest wisdom for to-day. Much has happened in Canada and the world during the last twelve or fifteen years. The General Assembly has to plan now, not for a Church less or more indifferent to the *discussion* of what seemed and seems to some a less or more academic ideal, but for a Church feeling intensely about *action* being planned for a definite goal. We are told that "firmness in pressing on now will secure Organic Union with one strong Church." With the conditions that certainly exist throughout the Church at this hour and with the feeling that will grow more heated the nearer the meeting of the General Assembly comes (unless a new turn is given to the discussion) it is plain that "firmness in pressing on" means that:

(*a*) A Presbyterian Church will remain, and the greater the firmness the surer the fact.

(*b*) Many thousands will be added to the number of non-churchgoers, a class already much too large.

(*c*) Many thousands more of our finest-tempered, peace-loving people will quietly attach themselves to other Communions.

(*d*) Many tens of thousands, especially in our self-supporting and better-to-do congregations from which we are receiving the larger portion of our Budget monies, will enter the new Church with a grudge, of necessity, against their will, and be thereafter brakes upon the wheels, unwilling and ungenerous sharers, and often non-sharers, in her activity and effort.

(*b*) Besides the Plan here suggested offers a great deal that is entirely new:—

(1) The Constituting of the Federal Church and the banding of the Units in a new fellowship and new forms of joint activity.

(2) The suggestions re Administrations, publication, etc.

(3) Most important of all it offers most sympathetic consideration for all "affiliated" and Independent Union Congregations, alike in matters of membership and property and thus provides for the re-arranging of mission charges and weaker congregations, all of which would mean economy in men and money.

The Council of Independent Union charges is one of the Units in the proposed Federal Church and would naturally enjoy the same right and opportunity of growth as the other Units.

The General Assembly at Toronto in 1921, sought to show consideration to all "affiliated" congregations in two directions:—

(*a*) In Resolution 4 of the Committee's Report (Minutes of Assembly, 1921, page 50), it was agreed "That Presbyterians who for the sake of Christian Unity unite with affiliated congregations, organized on the plan authorized by the General Assembly, may justly consider themselves in vital fellowship and communion with the Presbyterian Church in Canada, even if for purposes of discipline and order they may be under a Methodist Conference or Congregational Union."

This Resolution was intended to meet the objection *often* and *justly* urged by loyal members of our Church "That in being handed over to the care of a Communion other than their own, they are being discriminated against in their ecclesiastical standing; that members in weaker congregations, rural or frontier, have to satisfy themselves with Church relationships which, it would seem, are not good enough for those more favorably circumstanced." But inasmuch as in the Plan here suggested, all members of the Units constituting the new Church, become members of the new Church, and thus *all* enjoy *common* standing, is not such an objection met and such disability removed?

(*b*) In 1921 the General Assembly agreed to Clause 7 of the Committee's Report (Minutes of Assembly, Page 50) to permit "with the consent of the local Presbytery, congregations uniting with the Methodist and Congregational Churches, according to the Plan authorized by the General Assembly, and affiliated with one or the other of the negotiating Churches, to dispose of Church property for the purposes of the United Congregations."

Our Legal Committee declared this "ultra vires" (Minutes of Assembly, 1922, page 508) and advised that it would require legislation from our Federal and Provincial Parliaments. Now, were all parties unanimous in seeking such legislation, no difficulty would probably be met with in securing it. Then, if neighborly good-will operated between the negotiating Churches in withdrawals and affiliations and sales of property on a 50-50 basis, we could solve the practical problems that confront us without affecting the identity or autonomy or property rights of any of the negotiating Churches.

(3) "The Plan takes into the new Church all present members of the negotiating Units with or without, and for some, perhaps, even against their consent."

ANSWER:—This objection holds with full force against the proposed Organic Union; whereas, for the Plan here proposed this other and major fact can be urged, that it does not take them *out* of their present membership or fellowship or in any way affect their legal status or rights.

An Ontario man may make his boast that he is an Ontario man, but whether he will or not, he is also a citizen of Canada, and rightly welcomed, each relationship helps and enriches the other.

IV. SOME POINTS IN SUPPORT OF PLAN

(1) It would be a great advance step, the greatest yet taken in cooperation between the negotiating Churches. It leaves the door open also for any other Church, for example, Anglican or Baptist, to come in at any time. Thus might be set up a National Church able to voice through its "Council" the Christian sentiment of our land on any great issue.

(2) It gives neither party in the Church all its way. It is less than that one party desires and more, perhaps, than the other wishes. But it is a positive step, and forward, and in the direction indicated by the majority votes of the Courts and of the people of the Church some years ago and supported by the votes of Presbyteries in recent months.

(*a*) By degrees, if, and as desired, the Polity of the new Basis could be introduced into all the Units constituting the new Church, e.g. If the suggestion of the Synod of Manitoba that the areas of the District Meeting and the Presbytery be made co-terminous, their Courts could meet *regularly* or *occasionally* at the same centre and on the same date, and *together,* (at least for fellowship, conference and inspirational addresses) thus giving an outlet to the Community spirit and helping to develop and guide it.

Fraternal delegates, at least, could be sent by one to the other and to meetings of the Boards of the Churches, thus giving and receiving information and developing understanding and good-will. They would *take counsel together* about all new work and any overlapping; would fuse or re-arrange preaching points, *do together* all such work as work among the Non-Anglo-Saxons, Social Service and Temperance, Sunday School, Church and Nation-wide Appeal for Missions or Evangelism, etc. At will they might even use in common the names suggested in the new Basis for the Church Courts. The Presbyterians might give up the name "Synod" and "General Assembly" and take instead "Conference" and "General Council." The Methodists and Congregationalists might take "Session" and "Presbytery" and "General Council" and all might adopt, as far as feasible, the plan for the settlement of Ministers.

Needless to say, this Plan, and much more, the Plan for Organic Union, would, in its detail and outworking, require much conference between the Units, with much careful thought, and would require, too, the passing of time and the lessons and guidance which experience would bring.

(*b*) If the proposed Plan were adopted, it would need to stand for a period of years, say at least ten or fifteen, so that the Churches and their Boards could lay plans and follow policies without confusing and restraining agitation.

(4) The Plan preserves what is distinctive in type in each Unit and allows for its natural expression and its appeal to those of different temperaments and Christian experience, thereby adding to the richness of the Church's life.

It provides, too for the continuance, in reasonable degree, of the friendly and stimulating rivalry that seems a necessity to our human nature's fullest activity.

At the same time, it sets all free without further distrust and strife, to face the tasks to which God is calling them. If accepted with good-will by all, it might very well bring to the sister Churches a larger content of enthusiasm and brotherly fellowship as well as of the sinews of war than the measure or Organic Union that now seems possible can bring.

Alarming deficits face two at least of the negotiating Churches and compelling opportunities at home and abroad, such as they have never known in the past, invite one and all. It surely cannot be the will of our common Head, the Prince of Peace, that we should exhaust our strength and resources in hurtful opposition, or celebrate the closing of a year of special study of the Mind and Ministry of our Lord in unbrotherly bitterness and ill-will. In such a case how impossible for the on-looking world to say as was said of the Early Church, "Behold how these Christians love one another!"

(5) The Plan offers, without displacement of effort or of interest, all the practical benefits that, so far as I can see, would accrue from Organic Union, while at the same time, it gives outward expression or visibility and definiteness to the Union sentiment of the Churches. Surely all could carry into it all their old loyalties and enthusiasms and con-

serve besides for the work of the Kingdom, energy and means now going into rival, wasteful propaganda.

If, within the Christian Church where the world looks for forbearance one with another, "the strong bearing the burdens of the weak," if, I say, for the sake of Union, we are to have as seems at date only too probable, disunion and strife, and the will of one party accomplished by the strong hand of superior numbers, there is ground of fear that the whole tone of religious life in Canada will be lowered and many men who believe that the Church ought to lead in conciliation and peace, will hold all religion in contempt and sneer at the Christian Church, its chief sponsor in our land.

(6) The Plan solves adequately for our day the problem that presses on us. If we can do that, we can safely leave in trust, the future and its problems. It is not given to man to see far ahead. He must do the best he can, day by day. Even the inspired leader of Israel had to content himself with less than ideal solutions of his problems. "For the hardness of hearts, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement."

(7) It should be kept in mind that the attempt to consummate Organic Union is dependent upon securing legislation from the Federal Parliament and the Provincial Legislatures. Application for the necessary Bills will be strongly and perhaps successfully resisted, with consequent delay and feeling, whereas the Plan herein suggested is entirely within the power of the Churches themselves.

In their present form it is felt by very many, even of those who have been consistent advocates of Organic Union from the outset of the movement, that the Bills should not be allowed to pass at all.

(8) In the thought of many a Union such as is here proposed comes not only nearer what is possible in the present divided state of our Church's thought, but nearer also to the New Testament ideal of the "Vine" of which believers are "the branches"; of the "One Body" and "many members"; of "the same Spirit" but "diversities of gifts." This answers better to the Master's prayer that "they all may be one as Thou, Father, art in me and I in Thee." It is thus believers are to live "endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace."

May not the very lack of definiteness in the organization of the proposed Federal Church, bring it the nearer in character to the "Invisible Church"—all true believers—and emphasize the more the thing that is vital to godliness and the condition of spiritual power in any Church, namely: not outward organization but an inner life "hid with Christ in God?"

V. CONCLUSION.

Conscious of the many difficulties in which this whole question has become involved, I humbly submit the proposed Plan to the earnest consideration of all concerned. Discussion by thoughtful men in all the Churches would, of course, modify and greatly improve it. I have no thought that the Plan is without difficulty. It breaks new ground, however, and is an attempt at something constructive. It seeks to be fair to all and helpful on behalf of the great interests involved. It is surely workable if there is now between the negotiating Churches the good-will and understanding that would make Organic Union workable at all. It has moderation, but it has also movement, and movement forward, and it leaves something to the future. It is offered as a means of reaching a fresh starting-point and of securing what the great mass of our people and of the religious public of Canada desire—Peace and Good-Will within the Presbyterian Household of Faith and within a much wider Fellowship.

D. R. DRUMMOND.

Hamilton, Ont., April, 1923.

Index

A.

ADMINISTRATION, in union secularized, 206 ff., 266
Administration, Presbyterian, spiritual, 201 ff., 266
Anglican position on union, 40-47
Arminius, 114, 115
Arminianism, 114, 117, 140, 149, 163, 173
Armstrong, Dr. W. D., 291
Authority in Pres. Ch., from Christ, 264-6, 268-9
Autocracy of incorporated church, 205

B.

BAPTIST position on union, 34-39
Baptist Calvinism, 157
Baptism, Union Article on, 119
Barrier Act, 23, 24, 29 (result of vote), 74, 80, 134, 148, 242, 244, 270-3; Dr. Campbell on, 272-3; Lord Davey on, 273
"Barricade Act", 273
Basis of Union, suggested, 16, 20; "completed," 24; approved 23, 24, 26; amended 26: summary of these changes, 127; implications of same, 129; Preamble to Basis, 122, 127, and Addendum II; reports of committee on, 132 ff.; Basis defective, 120-1, 129
Bill (Church Union), 274-283
Blakely, M.D.M., 74
Boynton, Geo. M., 158-9
Briggs, Professor, 141
Brown, Fred. R., 54
Burial Hill Declaration, 159
Burwash, Chancellor, 118, 166-7, 170

C.

CALVIN, John, 144-6; his Institutes, 162
Calvinism, 114, 117, 149, 154, 157, 159, 163, 166, 170, 173; five points of, diluted, 192-3
Cameron, W. A., (Sask.), 56, 100, 103, 106, 296-8.
Campbell, Dr. Robert, 88, 92, 99, 152, 165, 190, 234-6, 272-3
Canada's religious future, 141-2
Carman, Gen. Supt., 119, 171, 243
Catechism, (Pres.), 119, 132, 137-8, 142, 153; cast aside in union, 192-3
— (Meth.), 119
— (Union propaganda), 65-69
Caven, Principal, on Westminster Conf., 188
Chown, Gen. Supt., 54, 56, 60, 85, 92-4
Christianity, modern, 156
Church Government in Basis, 233 ff.
Church (The), ignored in Basis, 205
Clark, Wylie C., 61
Clark, Dr. W. J., 291
Clay, Dr. W. Leslie, 78-9
Clerical authority in union, 204
Clogg, Professor, 225-7
Coffin, Dr. H. S., 228-9
Conferences of Joint Committee on Union, 20, 114-5
Congregationalists' part in Union, 19; ready for, 26; committee to confer with Anglicans, 46
Congregationalism, 157-161
Co-operation, 17, 28, 30-1, 33, 93, 100-1, 106, 175
Conscience; liberty of, 196-7
Continuance of Pres. Church, discussion of not permitted by Assembly, 23; literature for, 24
Courts of Pres. Church, own headship of Christ, 268
Credal subscription, 130-145, 191-2
Cromwell, Oliver; his appeal to Edin. Assembly, 268
Cross, Professor, 94
Cunningham, Dr. J. D., 52, 72, 87, 278-81
Curtis, Professor, 143, 157-8, 166

D.

DALL, Professor, 184, 197
Davey, Lord, 273
Definite belief and character building, 192
Denney, Professor, 73, 90, 222
Developments re union (1914-21), 27-33
Dickie, Dr. R. W., 78
Digest of Church Union Bill, 282-3
Discipline (2nd. Bk.), 200, 202

Disunion and disruption, 30, 158
Doctrine, not organically united in Basis, 194
Doctrinal Basis, opinions on, 146-156; lightly spoken of, 147; enthusiastically favoured, 147-9; favoured with qualifications, 151-4; writer's comments thereon, 154-6; three conflicting opinions, 155; writer's conclusion therefrom, 155-6
Doctrinal Implications of Union, 214-232
— Diversity of opinion, 214
— Basis unsatisfactory, 214
— Doctrine not a prime motive, 214
— Doctrine of Churches changed, 214
— Arminianism and Calvinism irreconcilable, 215
— Basis and modern theology, 215
— Union practical, doctrine minimized, 215-6
— Doctrinal Basis hastily formed, 216
— Why a new creed not framed, 217
— Westminster Confession challenged, 217-8
— Social gospel neglected, 218
— Basis too elaborate, 218; should be improved or discarded, 219-224; not broad enough for reunion of all churches, 224-5; spiritual basis alone possible for re-union, 225-7
— Doctrinal implication as to Polity, 227-9
— Toleration necessary for unity, 229-30
— Community of temper more important than that of creed or organization, 230
— Denominationalism weakening, 231
— Common motives and work a logical basis where doctrine fails, 231-33
Dods, Dr. Marcus, 230
Dogma, 129
Donald, C. D., 62
Drummond, Dr. D. R., 211-2, 435 ff.
Drysdale, A. H., 140
Duncan, Geo. P., 202
Du Val, Dr. F. B., 114-5, 118, 170
Dyde, Prof. S. W., 14, 41, 51, 62, 63, 79

E.

Eakin, Professor, 100
Economy re union, 15, 97, 99, 100, 103
Edmison, Dr. J. H., 55, 57
Educational policy of United Church, 208
Ethics, Christian, 119
Election, doctrine of, 63, 118, 152
Elder & Eldership in Union, 201-2
Elders abolished in union, 260-1

F.

Fairbairn, Prin. A. M., 160
Falconer, Prof. J. W., 194-6, 206-8
Falconer, Sir Robert, 119, 291
Fatalism, 115
Federal union, 21, 155, 300-1
— Dr. Drummond's plan, 211-2, 335-344
Federation, 22-23, 32, 41, 101, 103, 105-6, 108-9, 157
Fictions on church union, 110 ff.
Fraser, Dr. Donald, 116, quoted in Addendum I (405 ff.)
Fraser, Prin. D. J., 13, 78, 95, 106, 133, 188-9, 250-1
Fraser, Dr. J. Keir, 72, 78
Frazer, G. S., 164
Free Church Case, 18
Fullerton, Dr. T. F., 86, 96

G.

Gains and Losses in Union: Congregational, 159-161; Methodist, 161-180; Presbyterian, 180-213
Gandier, Principal, 134
General Assembly, Presbytery, and Peoples' Rights, 264-270
General Assembly, the Totality; Presbytery, the Unit, 266-7
General Assembly: appeal against 268; powers of, 269; members of, representatives not delegates, and responsible to Christ as Head of Church, 267-8
General Council of union churches, 32
Gordon, Principal, 243
Graham, Dr. J. H., 186-7, 193
Gregg, Prof. W., 13, 233-7, 239-41

H.

Harrison's Oliver Cromwell, 268
Herridge, Dr. W. T., 60, 291
Hiatus of reordination overlooked in Basis, 259
Hill, on constitution of Church of Scotland, 237

Hodge, Prof. Chas., on Presbyterianism, 234

I.

INDEPENDENT union churches, 31
Incorporated church tends to autocracy, 205
Intercommunion or exchange of pulpits, 43

J.

JOINT Committee on Union, first meeting, 19
— 1921 decisions, 32
Jowett, Dr. J. H., 89

K.

KILPATRICK, Prof. T. B., 49, 52, 55
Kind of Church Union Canada needs, 284-301
Knox, John, 153

L.

LAMBETH Proposals etc., 21, 36, 41-46
Lapsarianism, "pre-", "inter-", "supra-", "infra"-, 114
Legal obstacles in union proposal, 274-283
Legislation, enabling, 24, 28, 30, 32, 73-77, 274-83, 292-3
Liberty of Conscience stressed by Canadian Presbyterians, 196
Local preachers in union, 207
Local union churches, 32; number of, 298
Losses in Union, see Gains and Losses

M.

MACBETH, Dr. R. G., 81
Macdonnell, Dr. D. J., 133
Macdonnell, Geo. F., K.C., 70, 72, 100, 137
MacKay, Charles, 190-1
MacKay, Dr. R. P., 116
MacKinnon, Principal, 183-4
MacLaren, Principal, 150
MacMillan, Prof. Cyrus, 199
MacPhail, Sir Andrew, 163
Macpherson, John, 234
Mail (Tor.), Editorial, re Winnipeg Assembly (1916), 81
Mair's "Digest of Church Laws," 142, 239
Manning, Dr. C. E., 84
Marks of the true Church (Van Dyke), 267
Mathews, Dean Shailer, 90
McConnell, Chaplain Major, 77
McCrie's History, 142
McGill, Prof. A. T., on Pres. authority, 264-5; on Assembly's right to reverse measures, 268-9
McKeen, John, 94
McLaren, Justice, 243
McLeod, Dr. D. D., 96, 107-8, 187, 203, 249-50
Membership, Pres. Admission to, 261
— Union admission to, 261
— of Session, Presbytery, and General Assembly, admission to, 257-8
Ministry and Education
— Methodist, 207
— Presbyterian, 207
Ministry (Pres.), not superior to Eldership, 237
— Scottish Hist. Soc. on this, 239
Methodism; defined, 161-2, 164
— Prof. Peake on, 233-4
— in Canada, England, and America, 164-5
— Contribution of to theology, 162-4
— Four "universals" of, 163
— Contribution of its preaching and hymnology, 163
— New Meth. Hymnal, 167
Methodism and Union Proposal
— Meth. Ch. inaugurated movement, 15
— Ready for union (1912), 26
— Literature for union, 49, 50-6, 59
— Contribution to doctrinal basis of union, 186-7
— Meth. polity predominates in Basis of union, 205
— Gains and losses in union, 171-6; writer's estimate of these, 176-9
Methodist
— Articles of religion, 169, 173
— Catechism, 169, 171
— Standards in Canada, 166
— Ordination vows, 167
— re Anglican worship, 164
— Gen. Supt., 166; office of, re union, 174
Methodist Polity, 165, 178
— Presbyterian organization of, 165
— Episcopal form of, 165
— Itinerant system of, 165
— Settlement Committee, 165, 173, 253-7
— Quarterly Board, 261
— Conference system, 262
— Connexional administration, 174

Moncrief, on relations of ministry and eldership, 239
Motives against Union, 70-113
— Signs of the times, 70-3
— History of union movement, 73-86
— Miscellaneous arguments against a "big merger church", 86-90
— Mechanical unification not supported by New Testament, 90-1
— Separate churches preferable, 91-9
— Basis of union unacceptable, 99
— Economy and efficiency in union dubious, 101-5
— Organic union not necessary, 105-8
— Other schemes never seriously considered, 108-9
— Music of spiritual harmony, not discordant organic union, needed, 109
Motives for Union, 49-69
— Signs of the times, 49
— Fulfilment of New Testament teaching, 49-50
— To show world spiritual unity, 50
— Sin to oppose organic union, 51
— Denominationalism obsolete, 52
— Miscellaneous arguments on this, 53-55
— Time for consolidation now, 55-60
— Organic union a national enterprise, 60-1
— Spiritual argument, 61
— A people's movement, 61-2
— Economic argument, 62-3
— Christian expediency, 63-4
— Fulfilment of contract, 65
— Organic union needed for new comers to Canada, 65
Murray, President, W. C., 248-9

N.

National Council's creed commission, 159
Neely, Bishop, 13
Negotiations re union, 13-48
Nelson, Dr. S. Banks, 77, 83, 87, 106
Nicene Creed (Lambeth), 44
No insuperable obstacle to union (1904), 116
Norm of doctrinal basis, 115, 117, 121

O.

Obscurantists, 196
Ordination
— Pres. sacrificed in union, 259
— Union questions ignore Church, 205; go back on Pres. standards, 210
— Questions for elders, 132
— By Conference not Presbytery in union, 249
— Not necessary for elders in union, 260
— Mutual, suggested, 42; not in Basis, 259
— Reciprocal, 46
Organic Union
— First advocated, 14
— Early obstructions and opposition, 17, 18
— Opposition organized, 24, 120
— of doctrine not in Basis, 194
Oliver, Principal, 55, 62, 65

P.

Parliament and union basis, 154
Parker, Dr. Joseph, 90-1
Paterson, Dean W. P., 143
Patrick, Principal, 14-5, 17, 20-1, 53, 148, 290-1
Peake, Professor, 233-4
Pedley, Dr. Hugh, 50
Pedley, J. W., 51
Peirce, Dr. Lorne A., 164
Perfection, doctrine of, 170
Perseverance, doctrine of, 152
People's rights disregarded by Gen. Assembly, 23, 24, 80, 269-70
Pidgeon, Dr. Geo., 55, 61, 65, 78-9, 278
Polity in basis of union, 233-273
— diversity of views, 247-252
— leaves much unsettled, 205-6
— Pres. gains, 252
— Pres. losses, 252-264
Potts, Dr. John, 114
Prayer, Article on, 119
Predestination, 152
Prejudice, 197-8
Presbyterianism, defined, 180-1
Presbyterian
— Administration, spiritual, 199
— Gains and losses in union, 180-212
— Church Assoc. literature, 73, 87, 89, 97, 105, 107
— Church Union Mov. Com., 51, 53-4, 59, 60-1, 64, 78-9
— Church, not sectarian, 141
— System, 174
Primate, Church of England in Canada, 45-6
Property, conveyance, 30; Gen. Assembly's promise to conserve rights of congregations, 30-1
Puritanism, 157

Q.

QUARTERLY Board in union, 202, 261
Questions
— asked on union ballot papers, 25, 29
— for church membership, Methodist 132, Presbyterian, 132, 137
— for ordination of elders, 132

R.

RAMSAY, Dr. D. M., 118
Redemption, particular, 152
Reid, Dr. W. D., 101-3
Relations of minister to doctrines of church, 133 ff.
Relation of ministry to eldership, 142, 237, 239
Remonstrants of Holland, 114
Rider, J. Herbert, 88
Rigg on church organization, 165
Rights of ministers in union charges, 31, 32
Rights of the people disregarded, 23, 24, 80, 109
Roberts, Dr. Richard, 153, 223-4
Rose, Prof. S. P., 162-3, 167
Rowell, Hon. N. W., K.C., 243
Roxburgh, F. D., 103

S.

SACRAMENTS, Presbyterian stress on, 208
Salvation, 114, 132, 134, 163
Sanctification, doctrine of, 170
Savonarola, 268
Savoy Confession, 159
Schaff, Prof. P., 159, 160, 166
Scott, Dr. E., 17, 70, 85, 89, 93-4, 110-3, 139
Scott, Marcus, 181
Scripture does not circumscribe Pres. doctrine, 142
Scrimger, Principal, 116, 118
Secession Church of 1773, Basis of, 266-7
Sentimentalists, 97
Settlement Committee, 203-4
— placed over Presbytery, 253-4, 258
— Results under, 254-7
Session, so called, 261
Shields, Dr. T. T., 86
Social Christianity, 149, 155, 173
Sovereignties (the great), 109; Sovereignty of God, 115
Sources of the twenty Articles, 114-121
Speer, Dr. Robt. E., 72, 97
Spiritual function of ministry and eldership, 239
Standards of Pres. Ch. in Canada, 181
Streeter, Dean B. H., on Restatement and Reunion, 227
Subscription (Credal), 116, 120; (not in Basis, 130-145, cf., Scottish Church's definite subscription, 142); 153, 155-6, 160, 173-4, 191-2

T.

TAYLOR, Chief Justice, 277-8
Taylor, T. Wardlaw, Ph.D., 76, 194, 198, 201
Thomas, Ernest, 13, 18, 19, 24
Thomson, D. A., 81
Tradition, 105

U.

UNION ballot papers, 25-6
Union Com. appointed, 17; first report of, 21, 22
Union churches, 31, 56-7, 104, 106, 112
Union, "desirable and practicable" (1904), 17
Union, early reasons for favouring, 17, 18
Union Movement (1911-22), 24-33
— Non-doctrinal, 155
Union of all churches, 43
Union polity and clerical authority, 204-5
Union of Pres. Church, 199, 266-7
Unitarianism, 140, 142, 158
Universalism, 141

V.

VAN DYKE, Dr. Henry, 267
Varieties of union churches, 114
Violation of pledges by unionists, 113
Vote on union
— Decided on, 22
— Dissents registered, 23
— Report of 1911 vote, 24-6
— report of (1916) vote, 29
— Vote (the), and broken pledges, 73-77
— Another vote demanded, 79-80

W.

WALKER, Prof. Williston, 159, 160
Wallace, Chancellor, 17-9
Warden, Dr. R. H., 52, 114
Watson's Institutes, 162
"Way out of Union Impasse," 211-2, 435-444
Wesley, John, 162, 168; his theology 162-4; his society, 162
Wesleyan revival's influence on doctrine, 163
Wesley's (Chas.) hymns, influence on doctrine, 163
Westminster Standards, 115, 117, 120-1, 133, 136-8, 143, 148, 152-5, 157, 159, 160, 169, 171, 173, 188, 190, 194
Western situation in Canada re union 101-5, 296-8
What New Standards of Faith involve, 214-232
Williams, Bishop, 21
Wilson, Dr. James, 100
Winchester, Dr. A. B., 99
Wood, Sir Kingsley, 89
Woods, Sir James, 55, 62, 65
Woodside, Dr. G. A., 52
Workman, Dr. H. B. 165
World Conference on Faith and Order, 49
Worship, Pres. Directory of, neglected in Basis, 142; type of union worship, speculative, 210
Wotherspoon and Kirkpatrick, on Ordination, 256-9

WARWICK
BROS. &
RUTTER
LIMITED
TORONTO
PRINTERS & BOOKBINDERS

287.92 M883C c.1
Morrow # Church Union in Canada; its history, moti
OISE
3 0005 02068108 9

287.92
M883C
Morrow
Church Union in Canada

287.92
M883C
Morrow
Church Union in Canada

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW
D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 21 06 20 06 014 5